MARCH 1971

MONTHLY REVIEW

N INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOLUME 22

10

MARXISM, NATIONALISM, & BLACK LIBERATION

EARL OFARI

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT

HARRY MAGDOFF

THE FUTURE OF SOCIALISM

PAUL M. SWEEZY

Okinawa in the American Empire

MARK SELDEN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME XXII | NUMBER 10 | MARCH 1971

REVIEW OF THE MONTH:
The Impact of U.S. Foreign Policy on Underdeveloped Countries
by Harry Magdoff 1
The Future of Socialism by Paul M. Sweezy 9
MARXISM, NATIONALISM, AND BLACK LIBERATION by Earl Ofari 18
OKINAWA IN THE AMERICAN EMPIRE by Mark Selden 35
CORRESPONDENCE: More on the Crisis in Canada
by Mordecai Briemberg and Bill Livant 52
More on the International Flow of Funds
by Joan Robinson 55
TO VIETNAM by Roberto Fernández Retamar 57
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 59

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August, when bimonthly, and copyright © 1971, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: USA: 116 West 14th Street, New York, N. Y. 10011. Telephone: (212) 691-2555.
Europe: Frances Kelly, 9 King Edward Mansions, 629 Fulham Road, London, S.W. 6., Telephone: Renown 8824.
MR Edizione Italiana, Viale Mazzini 4, Roma 00195, Telephone: 383112.

Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$7 in the U.S.; $8 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $12; elsewhere $14.
By air mail—No. America $14; So. America and Europe $18; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $20.

EDITORS: Paul M. Sweezy Harry Magdoff Leo Huberman (1903-1968)
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Bobbye Ortiz

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Ugly rumors have been circulating in Canada concerning the Canadian edition of Pierre Vallières' *White Niggers of America,* which MR Press has just published in the United States. What appears to have been a calculated campaign of slander against MR came to a head with the publication of a story in the Toronto journal *New Canada.* At the time of writing we do not know whether *New Canada* has printed or intends to print our reply; and since we are very anxious for our friends in Canada (as well as elsewhere) to know the truth, we reprint here the reply in its entirety:

January 25, 1971

New Canada
Box 6106, Station "A"
Toronto, 1, Ontario
Dear Friends:

We can understand your anger at the things you think we have done to Pierre Vallières' book *Négres blancs d'Amérique,* but your correspondent is completely misinformed in every respect.

(*Continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IMPACT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY ON UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

By Harry Magdoff

The two pieces that follow were presented in a series of discussions on topics of current interest in a course on political economy at American University in the 1970 fall semester. There were two speakers on each topic. In the case of "The Impact of U.S. Foreign Policy on Underdeveloped Countries," Harry Magdoff led off, while on "The Future of Socialism," Paul Sweezy responded to a presentation by Robert Heilbroner.

—*The Editors*

Compressing an analysis of the impact of U.S. foreign policy on underdeveloped countries into a twenty minute presentation must necessarily result in what may appear to be a recitation of dogmatic assertions. This will seem especially so when the position taken flies in the face of conventional wisdom and the common currency of academic discourse. Yet even though such compression involves omission of supporting evidence, steps in the reasoning process, and necessary qualifications, a digest of the main argument may nevertheless help clarify the essential differences between the radical and customary views on the subject.

The crux of my position is that there exists a fundamental clash between U.S. foreign policy and the interests of the people in the underdeveloped world. To examine the roots of this clash—of what in effect is a conflict of interest—we need first to be clear about the answers to two questions:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) What is U.S. foreign policy? and (2) What are the major restraints on the modernization of underdeveloped nations?

The stumbling block to answering the first question is that U.S. foreign policy may at first blush seem to be but a jumble of diverse, bumbling, and contradictory actions and programs. In fact, learned journals specializing in international affairs will at times publish lengthy articles complaining about the absence of a clear-cut foreign policy consistent with avowed principles. But these yearners for consistency overlook, on the one hand, the variety of pressures that contribute to day-to-day policy decisions, and, on the other hand, the inevitable contrast between the ideology and ideals of foreign policy around which public opinion is mobilized and the underlying reality.

Even though the day-to-day policy decisions are the product of numerous, and not necessarily consistent, political, military, and economic variables, and even though these decisions are made by diverse human beings, some competent and some incompetent, a clearly discernible major trend of foreign policy nevertheless does exist. We know from physics and chemistry that elements and compounds will, under certain conditions of volume, pressure, and temperature, assume different phases. But we also know that while water, for example, may under certain conditions appear as steam and under other conditions as ice, its inherent nature remains H_2O. A similar essential nature of U.S. foreign policy can be detected throughout the various phases of hot war, cold war, strident militancy, and moments of hesitation. This major drift of U.S. foreign policy has two closely related components:

1. A drive to maintain as much of this globe as possible free for private trade and private enterprise. Subsumed under this are such considerations as (a) the prevention of competitive empires from acquiring privileged trading and investment preserves to the disadvantage of U.S. business interests, and (b) wherever feasible, the attainment of a preferred trading and investment position for U.S. business.

2. The promotion of counter-revolution. This too is composed of several elements: (a) abortion of incipient social revolutions, (b) suppression of social revolutions in process,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and (c) counter-revolution against established socialist societies —through war, economic pressure, or corruption of leaders and nations in the socialist fold.

Such a basic foreign policy is not peculiar to the United States, nor is it a policy peculiar to the post-Second-World-War period. The conflict of interest among the advanced capitalist nations for the division and re-division of the world has been an integral part of what the textbooks call "modern history," hammered into the annals by two world wars. Nor is the nervous, military reaction to social revolutions merely a current policy aberration. It is now one hundred years since the conquering German army joined forces with the conquered French army to throttle the Paris Commune. Long before the atom bomb was developed and long before the Soviet Union could be considered an effective expansionist power, the Allied Powers at the Versailles Treaty table were plotting the destruction of the infant Bolshevik revolution. In fact, the United States along with other Allied Powers sent armed forces to join the counter-revolution against the Bolsheviks. It is within this historic context, and the even longer record of expansionism in the growth of our republic, that the consistency of U.S. foreign policy can be traced.

A foreign policy of this sort has special relevance for the underdeveloped nations because it is precisely social revolution —the nemesis of U.S. policy—that is the order of the day in the Third World. To appreciate this clash of interests we need to examine the second question raised above: what holds back modernization of the underdeveloped nations?

The usual textbook approach to the industrial backwardness of the Third World is to list a host of twenty, thirty, or more common characteristics of underdevelopment. The trouble with such an approach is that little distinction is made between symptoms and causes. More often than not, in this seemingly hopeless amassing of difficulties, a way out is sought by focussing on a panacea such as population control—and even that panacea is examined as a technical problem, independent of the social and economic environment which contributes to the pressure of population and remains an obstacle to "gimmicky" solutions.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If these long, eclectic arrays of symptoms of underdevelopment have any virtue, it is to illustrate that the problem has deeper roots than, for example, the popularly held notion that lack of natural resources is a major cause of a nation's poverty and stagnation. In fact, there are advanced countries with poor resources and underdeveloped countries with rich natural resources. More important, the very extensiveness of the number of characteristic features of underdevelopment suggests the potential inadequacy of mere tinkering with reforms of existing social structures, and introduces the issue of a need for wholesale restructuring and redirection of these societies.

The main direction of U.S. academic thought and U.S. foreign policy, however, is to shrink from the dangerous implications of restructuring social and economic systems. Instead, the focus is on simpler, more comfortable, and safer ways out: population control and the spread of modern technology through foreign investment and foreign aid. The more thoughtful advocates of the population-control remedy recognize that it is far from a cure-all. At best, it is a stop-gap measure (assuming it can work under the existing socioeconomic conditions) to hold the line against a mounting danger of mass starvation in face of the slight progress made in increasing food production.

The more basic remedy is usually identified as the transfer of capital and technology from the rich to the poor nations: a consequence of the conventional diagnosis that the underlying causes of backwardness are the lack of modern technology and the shortage of domestic capital. Such a prescription is clearly consistent with the diagnosis; it is also consistent with the ideology under which U.S. foreign policy parades. The trouble is that the diagnosis is wrong.

To many in the advanced nations, and especially to those in the United States, technology looms as a talisman, a type of magic art: just let it loose in foreign lands and all the wonders of prosperity will follow. One needs only to reflect a bit on the U.S. condition to realize how shallow this faith is. Thus, despite the availability of the most advanced technology and despite the large transfers of funds, the Appalachian

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

region remains a major pocket of poverty and underdevelopment. And how far have technology and a surplus of domestic capital gone in solving the poverty of the ghettos?

The dimensions of the poverty problem are much greater, of course, in the underdeveloped nations. But to understand the question of inadequate technology in those regions, we have to recognize that technology does not stand alone—it needs people to use it. And it is on the latter we have to concentrate for an answer: the willingness and ability of the people inside the country to apply improved technology which will put the unemployed to work and which will raise the output of the people at work. To take advantage of technology, it is necessary, among other things, to have a literate population, a high social evaluation of science and scientific method, and receptivity on a mass scale to technological innovation. This is especially so because the technology most needed is not arcane computers and complex electronic systems in a few key cities, but an extensive spread of technology throughout the agricultural sector—that sector in which the largest part of the population of the underdeveloped countries is to be found.

This does not mean that more advanced technology could not be used to good advantage. We need to understand though that there is no instant magic, no basic solution to the problems of development, in the wonders of modern science and technology. The requirements in the Third World—where an agricultural as well as an industrial revolution is needed—extend to steel plows, wheelbarrows, small pumps, and irrigation systems. The need is not only for equipment, but for selection of seeds and plants and improved techniques in the use of the land. For this, the mass of farmers who till the soil have to be involved. And, for this, the mass of people have to change; more important, the constraints on the development of the people have to be removed.

The crucial obstacles to the needed changes are not to be found in the innate nature of the people, or in special features of their culture, or in their religion. The obstacles, instead, are located in the social institutions under which the people live, in the type of landowning, in the vested interests of the large landowners and businessmen, and in the social priorities im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

posed by the ruling classes. Let me cite a simple illustration. One of the puzzling aspects of India's economic trials has been the seeming indifference of small farmers to undertake *simple work needed to irrigate the land they work. The Indian* government spent large sums of money to dig broad canals in order to make more water available for farming. But the farmers failed to take advantage of this potential boost to their output; they did not dig the ditches needed to bring the water from the rivers and canals to their small plots. I once asked a leading U.S. agricultural specialist who had spent a great deal of time in India: what went wrong? was it laziness? stupidity? ignorance? The conservative agronomist laughed at my naive questions. The simplest and most ignorant farmer, he explained patiently, knows the importance of water. But the irrigation ditches had to pass over land owned by big landowners who exacted a tax for the use of the ditches—a tax the farmers could not possibly pay.

Furthermore, given a profit-directed economy along with extensive poverty, there is no percentage in the mass production of improved farm tools, equipment, and chemicals needed for upping farm output. The technology for most of these essential products is not complex, nor are the domestic businessmen stupid. The entrepreneurs do not do what is needed for economic development because there is not enough potential profit in such undertakings, or because they can make more profit in other ventures.

For these reasons, and others, social revolutions are the order of the day for most of the underdeveloped world; revolutions that remove the power of those classes whose interests are in the status quo; revolutions that change the social priorities, open the floodgates of education, arouse the enthusiasm of large masses of the people, and change the production structure to produce what is needed for the advancement of the people and not what brings the most profit to the property owners.

Once the issue of social revolution is introduced, the capital-shortage factor—a primary canon of economic orthodoxy—assumes a new significance. First, the revolution can quite quickly halt two major sources of waste of capital: (a) by severely reducing the consumption of the rich and the better-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heeled middle classes, and (b) by confiscating foreign-owned investments. Such steps are useful in two ways: (a) the profits of agriculture, manufacturing, mining, and commerce can be fully utilized for the most important development projects, and (b) scarce foreign exchange can be more effectively applied to purchase of raw materials and equipment, instead of being drained off for the import of luxuries and for payment of profits, interest, royalties, and management fees to foreign investors.

The second contribution a social revolution makes to the tackling of the capital-shortage obstacle is through mobilization of labor to be used to some degree as a substitute for capital. A great deal of necessary construction, for example, can be obtained this way. Naturally, it would be better to use machinery. But if there is no machinery, and the need is great, idle and underutilized labor can be used, for example, for road-building, flood control, irrigation works, and housing construction—as was done in the centuries before there were bulldozers, trucks, cranes, etc. This is not the ideal solution, but it is a solution that faces up to the reality that God helps those who help themselves. If you will permit me another homely illustration, let us consider the question of rat control. In many of the underdeveloped countries, the rat population destroys a significant proportion of the annual farm crop. With adequate capital investment, it is possible to string electrified low wires around fields that will kill marauding rats. Since there is little electricity and no money for wires, the rats get their fill. Ironically, as has been shown by the revolution in China, the organized effort of masses of people, devoted to first things first, can get rid of the rats, without benefit of modern technology.

A third contribution to overcoming the capital-shortage problem is the revolution's concentration on education and health for the masses. Aside from humanitarian considerations, improved nutrition and medical care contribute to raising the productivity of labor. Education quite obviously adds to human capital. For many of these countries, the issue is not only the achievement of universal literacy but redirection of the educational priorities from one of training an elite ruling group (schooled in the humanities, law, and medicine for the urban

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well-to-do) to one that builds on (a) science and mathematics needed for mastery of technology and greater self-reliance, and (b) politics and economics needed for resourceful and effective economic and social planning. Again, the need is not only for the seemingly esoteric and complex. To advance in scientific farming, farmers who can confidently keep books and do arithmetic are needed. The question we need to ask ourselves is: Why, in the twentieth century, has it taken social revolutions to make the most dramatic leaps in health and education for the vast majority of the population?

From whichever angle we approach the problem of development, we hit against the limits imposed by the established social institutions and the priorities (or values, if you wish) protected by the existing ruling classes. And these are the very ruling classes that are protected and nurtured by the advanced capitalist nations—most particularly in these days, by the military and foreign policy of the United States. The social systems of the underdeveloped countries have a long history, one that is dominated by the colonial and semi-colonial arrangements imposed under the *force majeure* of the successful and rich capitalist nations. Primarily by force, but also by the perpetuation of the resulting economic relations, the Third World was converted primarily into a supplier of raw materials and food for the metropolitan centers, and a buyer, to the extent its resources permitted, of the manufactured goods produced in the industrialized nations. The resulting economic structure created at one and the same time (a) an economy whose resources are bent to supply the needs of the industrialized nations, and (b) ruling classes whose prosperity, whether they like it or not, stems from a perpetuation of this dependency; in short, a subservient component of the imperialist network of trade and investment.

A new departure toward development, instead of underdevelopment, entails a restructuring of these industrially backward economies to obtain greater flexibility and a more effective use of their own resources, a redirection of their societies to meet the needs of the people rather than to foster the prosperity of the wealthy at home and abroad. Necessarily contained in this new departure is, in addition, a release from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the psychological dependence on the culture and "superiority" of the advanced nations, along with the blossoming in the population as a whole of self-confidence, self-reliance, and independence in thought and action. By exerting its efforts to contain the revolutionary impulse that seeks to free itself from the material and psychological bonds of imperialism, U.S. foreign policy (including its military posture and action), in effect, is the primary obstacle to the development of the underdeveloped nations.

THE FUTURE OF SOCIALISM

By Paul M. Sweezy

The last thing I want to do is enter into a formal debate with Professor Heilbroner. With much of what he says on the subject before us,* I am in agreement; and even where I am not in agreement, I find most of what he has to say interesting and worthwhile. It would, I think, be largely a waste of time for all of us if I were to single out and elaborate on differences of this kind.

There are, however, differences of another sort that are not mentioned or even alluded to in his presentation, which I think are important and which I want to make explicit. These are what you might call differences of approach and emphasis which, taken together, I suppose define my view of the future

* In the essay "Reflections on the Future of Socialism" in his book *Between Capitalism and Socialism* (New York, 1970).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of socialism as not only different from his but also in a way incommensurate with his.

Professor Heilbroner sees capitalism and socialism as two co-existing, alternative, and, at least to some degree, competing social systems. He believes that both will be in existence during our lifetime (and I presume he means yours as well as his and mine), and he presents no reason for thinking that the same situation will not prevail during the lifetimes of our children and our children's children. The two systems are there for everyone to see and evaluate: you pays your money and takes your choice.

I'm afraid I can't quite see it that way. Capitalism is not a matter of individual countries and still less of free choice. It is a matter of the history of the whole globe—or, as the ecologists like to say nowadays, of the spaceship earth—for the last four hundred years, i.e., for the whole of what is commonly called modern history. In my view you cannot understand capitalism or socialism, hence the future prospects of either system, except as the product of that historical experience.

Capitalism had its birth in a small corner of the globe in Mediterranean and Northwestern Europe. But it didn't become a decisive historical force until the European capitalist societies mastered firearms and the art of long-distance navigation. Armed with these technological achievements, they broke out of their small corner and roamed the seven seas—conquering, subjugating, looting, and trading. It was these proceedings that gave the impetus to the famous economic takeoff. At home the peasantry was uprooted from the land to form the basis for that *sine qua non* of any capitalist system, a free wage-working proletariat—free of feudal ties, free of property, and with no way to earn a livelihood save through the sale of its labor power. The other side of the capitalist coin was the amassing of liquid capital, much of which was provided from the loot and profits derived from the subjugated countries of the periphery. This whole process—the formation of a proletariat and the amassing of capital—was given a name by Marx: the original accumulation of capital.* It was the beginning of the split of the globe

* The usual English translation is "primitive accumulation." This, however, is both inaccurate and misleading. The German word is *ursprüng-*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between a handful of rich exploiting countries and a multitude of poor exploited ones.

What must be understood is (a) that the split has continued in existence ever since, despite all changes in forms and techniques of dominance; (b) that it has grown relatively wider and wider; and (c) that the situation of the poor exploited countries has deteriorated not only relatively but in many respects absolutely as well. This contrast between development of a few countries on the one hand and continuous underdevelopment of many on the other is the key to all modern history.

The split and its aggravation are aspects and consequences of the global capitalist system: *they are the way the system works.* To talk about remedying the situation within the framework of the capitalist system is a contradiction in terms. It is a reflection either of ignorance or of a will to deceive.

The only way out of this bind is through rejection of the capitalist system, i.e., through socialist revolution. And more and more countries have been taking it since Russia pioneered the way in 1917. The obverse, inevitable under the circumstances, has been that the increasingly dominant concern of the rich exploiters has been to keep the remaining ones inside the capitalist compound. Leadership in this task naturally falls to the lot of the dominant capitalist power, which explains why the United States since the Second World War has assumed in the eyes of the world the role of global gendarme and prison warden.

So we have now, as the result of four centuries of history, two overriding processes in the capitalist world: deepening underdevelopment in its dependent part, and global civil war (overt or latent as the case may be) between the dominant metropolis and the dominated periphery.

These are enough reasons, I think, for believing that this system has no *historical* future: by this I mean that it may last my lifetime or yours or our children's but that it offers no prospect for humanity to go forward and is therefore historically doomed. As it happens, however, there are other reasons of a different order that are equally compelling, and any speculation about the future which omits them from consideration can

lich which literally means "original" and is exactly what Marx meant to convey.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no longer be considered adequate. I refer of course to the threat of ecological disaster which has always been inherent in capitalism's inexorable drive to expansion and which now, in the second half of the twentieth century, has moved from the wings to the center of the historical stage. Here I can do no better than quote the words of Professor Heilbroner himself:

> Ultimately, the ecological crisis represents our belated awakening to the fact that we live on . . . our Spaceship Earth. As in all spaceships, sustained life requires that a meticulous balance be maintained between the life-support capability of the vehicle and the demands made by the inhabitants of the craft. Until quite recently, those demands have been well within the capability of the ship, both in terms of its ability to supply the physical and chemical requirements for continued existence and to absorb the waste products of the voyagers. This is not to say that the earth has been generous—short rations have been the lot of mankind for most of its history—nor is it to deny the recurrent advent of local ecological crises: witness the destruction of whole areas like the erstwhile granaries of North Africa. But famines have passed and there have always been new areas to move to. The idea that the earth as a whole was overtaxed is new to our time.
>
> For it is only in our time that we are reaching the ceiling of earthly carrying capacity, not on a local but on a global basis. Indeed, as will soon become clear, we are well past that capacity, provided that the level of resource intake and waste output represented by the average American or European is taken as a standard to be achieved by all humanity. To put it bluntly, if we take as the price of a first-class ticket the resource requirements of those passengers who travel in the Northern Hemisphere of the Spaceship, we have now reached a point at which the steerage is condemned to live forever—or at least within the horizon of the technology presently visible—at a second-class level; or at which a considerable change in living habits must be imposed on first class if the ship is ever to be converted to a one-class cruise.*

Commenting on this analysis, Professor Gurley of Stanford adds:

> This analysis has many implications for both the rich and the poor. . . . In attempting to achieve economic development, today's poor around the world have a few advantages over their predecessors of a few hundred years ago—the advantages of increased knowl-

* Robert L. Heilbroner, "Ecological Armageddon," in *Between Capitalism and Socialism, op. cit.*, pp. 270-271.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

edge and of better technologies. But they are at a disadvantage in several crucial ways. First, they do not have the opportunities which the early Europeans and Americans had of gaining huge flows of economic resources through plunder, slavery, and fraud. Second, I have argued that they are burdened by a powerful alliance within the world capitalist system which works for ends that are often opposed to their basic needs. And finally, to the extent that the above "ecological argument" is correct, the present poor are further condemned by the fact that the rich states are hell-bent on a growth path of demanding and producing ever more GNP, and in the process using up exhaustible resources that the poor must have if they are going to raise their own living standards to half-way decent levels.*

For the purposes of my present argument, all I need to add is that both the "powerful alliance within the world capitalist system" and the condition of being "hell-bent on a growth path of demanding and producing ever more GNP" are absolutely basic aspects of capitalism itself. We are rapidly approaching a time when the continued existence of capitalism will no longer be compatible with the continued existence of the human race.

Is socialism the inevitable alternative and answer? This, it seems to me, is the way the problem of the future of socialism should be posed. And the answer, I think, is that if the human race survives, it can *only* be through socialism, i.e., through developing a non-exploitative, collective society which has been able to learn the lessons of four centuries of capitalism and has come to understand that a radically different course is a *sine qua non* if mankind is to have any historical future at all.

The first half-century of socialism hardly provides conclusive evidence as to whether or not mankind has actually found the key to survival. Soviet Russia has great achievements to its credit, not least the defeat of Nazi Germany in the Second World War. But I do not believe it can be said that the USSR has created, or even shown the way to, a radically new society; and as times goes on it seems to revert more and more

* John G. Gurley, "The State of Political Economics," paper prepared for delivery at the 1970 annual meeting of the American Economic Association.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the condition of a class society with values and goals increasingly difficult to distinguish from those of developed capitalist societies. In this connection, allow me to quote what Leo Huberman and I wrote about Soviet experience on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution:

> The facts indicate that relative to most other countries in the world today, the Soviet Union is a stable society with an enormously powerful state apparatus and an economy capable of reasonably rapid growth for the foreseeable future. It is also a stratified society, with a deep chasm between the ruling stratum of political bureaucrats and economic managers on the one side and the mass of working people on the other, and an impressive spectrum of income and status differentials on both sides of the chasm. The society appears to be effectively depoliticized at all levels, hence *a fortiori* non-revolutionary. In these circumstances the concerns and motivations of individuals and families are naturally focused on private affairs and in particular on individual careers and family consumption levels. Moreover since the economy is able to provide both an abundance of career openings and a steadily expanding supply of consumer goods, these private motivations are effective in shaping the quantity, quality, allocation, and discipline of the labor force. There is probably no capitalist country in the world today, with the possible exception of Japan, in which classical bourgeois mechanisms operate as efficiently to secure the kinds and amounts of work needed to propel the economy forward.
>
> But the prevalence of these mechanisms, and indeed their very success, cannot but have a profound influence on the quality of the society and the "human nature" of its members. This is part of the ABC of socialist thought and need not be elaborated upon here: suffice it to say that the privatization of economic life leads necessarily to the privatization of social life and the evisceration of political life. Bourgeois values, bourgeois criteria of success, bourgeois modes of behavior are fostered. Politics becomes a specialty, a branch of the division of labor, like any other career. And of course the other side of the coin is the perpetuation and deepening of that alienation of man from his fellows which many socialists have felt to be the ultimate evil of bourgeois society.*

Unfortunately, nothing that has happened in the three years since this was written has led me to revise this negative view of trends in Soviet society. Rather the contrary: I am more and more inclined to accept Charles Bettelheim's contention that

---

* Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, "Lessons of Soviet Experience," MONTHLY REVIEW (November 1967), pp. 11-12.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet society today is a form of state capitalism ruled by a new state bourgeoisie.* If this is true, it means that the world's first attempt to build a socialist society was abortive.

Similar things have happened in history before. For example, there can be little doubt that genuine capitalist societies arose in a number of Italian city states during the Middle Ages, only to wither away or be destroyed from outside. Apparently capitalism needs to attain a certain critical size in terms of population and territory before it can be assured of survival, and this did not occur until the (European) Age of Discovery in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Capitalism, in other words, put in a few abortive appearances before it finally "made it" on the stage of history. Perhaps we are witnessing an analogous process now as China and North Korea and North Vietnam struggle to build socialist societies independently of, and partly in opposition to, the Soviet Union.

The crucial question, it seems to me, is whether these new attempts to build socialism are doomed to follow the Soviet Union on the road back to class-dominated societies, or whether they have succeeded in creating genuinely new social structures which have a reasonable prospect of moving forward toward the historic goals of socialism (and ultimately communism). If only because of its size and population, I suppose it would be generally admitted that China is the country most likely to provide a conclusive answer. And it is precisely in China that we find what I think are the most interesting and encouraging developments. There is unfortunately no possibility, within the limited scope of this paper, to explore this subject in any detail, but I would not want to end without at least indicating the respects in which I believe China to be pioneering a course radically different from that which has led the Soviet Union to its present condition. And for this purpose I can do no bettter than quote at some length from a remarkable study by Professor Gurley of Stanford University who has been cited above in a different context. Gurley's subject is "Capitalist and Maoist Economic Development,"** but what he says about capitalist

* See, for example, Charles Bettelheim, "On the Transition Between Capitalism and Socialism," MONTHLY REVIEW (March 1969).

** MONTHLY REVIEW (February 1971).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development could be applied, with only minor modifications, to Soviet development as well.

The Maoists' disagreement with the capitalist view of economic development is profound. Their emphases, values, and aspirations are quite different from those of capitalist economists. To begin with, Maoist economic development occurs within the context of central planning, public ownership of industries, and agricultural cooperatives or communes. . . . The profit motive is officially discouraged from assuming an important role in the allocation of resources, and material incentives, while still prevalent, are downgraded.

But perhaps the most striking difference between the capitalist and Maoist views is in regard to goals. Maoists believe that, while a principal aim of nations should be to raise the level of material welfare of the population, this should be done only within the context of the development of human beings and of encouraging them to realize fully their manifold creative powers. And it should be done only on an egalitarian basis—that is, on the basis that development is not worth much unless everyone rises together; no one is to be left behind—either economically or culturally. Indeed, Maoists believe that rapid economic development is not likely to occur *unless* everyone rises together. Development as a trickle-down process is therefore rejected by Maoists, and so they reject any strong emphasis on profit motives and efficiency criteria that lead to lopsided growth. Their emphasis, in short, is on man rather than on "things." (pp. 17-18)

The failure of many economic experts on China to tell the story of her economic development accurately and fully is bad enough. But even worse, I think, has been the general failure to deal with China on her own terms, within the framework of her own goals and methods for attaining those goals, or even to recognize the validity of those goals. Communist China is certainly not a paradise, but it is now engaged in perhaps the most interesting economic and social experiment ever attempted, in which tremendous efforts are being made to achieve an egalitarian development, an industrial development without dehumanization, one that involves everyone and affects everyone. But all those efforts seem not to have affected Western economists. . . . Apparently it does not matter that 775 million people are involved in a gigantic endeavor to change their environment, their economic and social institutions, their standard of living, and themselves. . . . (pp. 29-30)

To which I would only add that this "most interesting economic and social experiment ever attempted" is precisely a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fully conscious effort to realize the historic goals of socialism. I believe that much in the future not only of socialism but of mankind in general depends on its success or failure.

Direct slavery is the pivot of bourgeois industry as well as machinery, credit, etc. Without slavery, North America, the most progressive country, would have been transformed into a patriarchal country. Efface North America from the map of the world and you would have the anarchy, the complete decadence, of modern commerce and civilization. Cause slavery to disappear, and you will have effaced America from the map of nations.

Thus slavery, because it is an economic category, has always existed in the institutions of the nations. Modern nations have known how to disguise slavery in their own lands alone, they have imposed it without disguise on the New World.

—Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*

The economists have a singular manner of proceeding. There are for them only two kinds of institutions, those of art and those of nature. Feudal institutions are artificial institutions, those of the bourgeoisie are natural institutions. In this they resemble the theologians, who also establish two kinds of religion. Every religion but their own is an invention of men, while their own religion is an emanation from God. In saying that existing conditions—the conditions of bourgeois production—are natural, the economists give it to be understood that these are the relations in which wealth is created and the productive resources are developed conformably to the laws of nature. Thus these relations are themselves natural laws, independent of the influence of time. They are eternal laws which must always govern society. Thus there has been history, but there is no longer any.

—Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXISM, NATIONALISM, AND BLACK LIBERALISM

BY EARL OFARI

During certain periods in the history of the black struggle, one of the questions that has repeatedly been raised is: What is the relevance of Marxism to black people? This question has prompted fierce debate among a number of groups and individuals. Some of the character and substance of this issue has been detailed by Harold Cruse in *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual.* Far from being conclusive, though, many of the arguments advanced both pro and con on Marxism have wound up in a dogmatic defense of one organizational faction or another. This is particularly unfortunate when one considers that today, more than ever, it is essential for black and oppressed people to possess a solid theoretical understanding of the historical trends that have shaped American society. This understanding is necessary for future positive planning and programming by blacks.

Marxist organizations have at varying points in U.S. history found themselves at odds with certain advocates of black nationalism. The clash between Garvey and the Communist Party as well as the early black socialists in the 1920s, between the NAACP and the CP in the 1930s and 1940s, and today between groups such as CORE and the Progressive Labor Party offer ample proof of this. Underlying the whole debate has been the question of whether the black struggle is primarily one

---

Earl Ofari is the author of *The Myth of Black Capitalism* (Monthly Review Press, 1970).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of race or class, whether the main enemy is racism or capitalism. This is admittedly a complex issue, one which does not lend itself to making a simple choice between one or the other, as George Padmore attempted to do some years ago in his work *Pan-Africanism or Communism?* In order to lay the groundwork for discussion, an effort must be made to assess the theoretical roots of the question.

I

Marx and Engels turned their attention to the problem of European expansion into the Third World in the 1850s. This was roughly about the same time that they began earnestly to sift material for their major study on European industrial society. Marx's basic writings on European colonization appeared as a series of articles in the *New York Daily Tribune*. Marx's and Engel's initial formulations on the nationalist movements in the colonized Third World thoroughly reflected the white Western point of view.

Although they did condemn the atrocities of the Europeans against non-whites, they nevertheless viewed colonialism as something desirable. Like capitalism, Marx saw this as a necessary stage of development. Like most Europeans then, he looked upon non-whites as "barbarians" and "savages" who could benefit not only from the political and economic systems of Europe but also from the social and cultural systems. In the beginning, he and Engels dismissed as primitive everything from the communalism of West Africa to the ancient cultural institutions of China. In Marx's Western eyes these were seen as "stagnant." In an article in the *Tribune* (June 25, 1853) on British rule in India, Marx wrote that

> we must not forget that these idyllic [Indian] village communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible compass, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies.

Engels was, at the start, even more contemptuous of the values of non-whites. He completely supported the French oc-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cupation of Algeria. In an article in the *Northern Star* (January 22, 1848), he noted that

> the conquest of Algeria is an important and fortunate fact for the progress of civilization. . . . [It] has already forced the Beys of Tunis and Tripoli, and even the Emperor of Morocco, to enter upon the road of civilization.

But as time passed, Marx and Engels began slowly to rethink many of their positions on the question of national movements of non-whites. They began to feel that perhaps there was more potential in the anti-colonial struggle than they had originally imagined. In the later decades of the nineteenth century, European colonial encroachment into Africa was almost complete. The Congress of Berlin in 1885, at which the African continent was partitioned among the European powers, was in fact not the beginning but the end of the European territorial grab in Africa. With the consolidation of colonial power in the 1860s and 1870s, Marx and Engels gradually became convinced that colonialism was turning out to be something quite different from what they had expected. In practice, it was nothing more than a vicious system of oppression and exploitation. In recognition of this, Engels in 1857 in an article on Algeria wrote:

> From the first occupation of Algeria by the French . . . the unhappy country has been the arena of unceasing bloodshed, rapine and violence. . . . The Arab and Kabyle tribes, to whom independence is precious, and hatred of foreign domination a principle dearer than life itself, have been crushed and broken by the terrible razzias. . . . The tribes still assert their independence and detestation of the French regime. . . .[1*]

Marx, some years later, began to change his view on the potential value of the communal system as a progressive structure:

> The analysis presented in *Capital* gives reasons neither for nor against the vitality of the village community, but the special study which I have made of it, and for which I have searched for the materials in original sources, has convinced me that this community is the strategic point of social regeneration in Russia.[2]

* Numbered notes will be found at the end of the article.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Interestingly, throughout this same period Marx and Engels took somewhat of an advanced position on the related question of self-determination and national struggles on the European continent. One of the first clear espousals of the principle of self-determination can be found in the writings of Marx and Engels. In the 1860s, Marx championed the cause of the Irish people for separation and self-government apart from England. In 1848, Marx had come out in support of independence for the nations held captive by the German Empire. Similarly, Engels was one of the most outspoken advocates of Polish independence.

They were, however, in no way absolutist on the question of self-determination. They felt that each national movement should be judged separately and on its own merits, before the working class of the particular ruling nation rendered any support. This was shown when, though supporting Ireland and Poland, they opposed the Pan-Slavic movement in Eastern Europe.

Nonetheless, despite the later modifications of the views of Marx and Engels on the national question, their analysis remained incomplete. In this area, classical Marxism suffered; it did not emerge as the comprehensive social model which it gave promise of becoming. This was the legacy that was passed on to the early white American Marxists.

At first, they preferred to ignore the national struggles of non-whites for liberation and self-determination. In attempting to gear their programs to American white industrial workers, who were thoroughly racist, in many instances these socialists themselves became quite open in their racism.

The Socialist Party (SP) at its founding convention in 1901 refused to pass any resolution dealing with racism or lynching. It was only at the insistence of William Costley, a black delegate, that the convention reluctantly adopted a resolution on the matter of black rights. The organizers of the SP felt that the black struggle should not be considered as separate from that of white workers. To them, the problems of blacks would be solved when the white working class seized control of the state and implemented socialism. Any attempt by blacks

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to speak of their special needs was treated with hostility by the Socialists. As W. Z. Foster pointed out:

> Thus, the new Socialist Party went on record to the effect that nothing in the specific situation of the Negroes was different enough from the general problems of the white workers to require that special demands be raised in their behalf. The Party saw the need to put forward immediate demands for workers, farmers, women and children, and upon many single issues—but it believed that the bitter plight of the Negroes called for no immediate action.[3]

Of the blacks who did join the SP, all at one time or another were critical of its racism. W. E. B. DuBois, who joined the Socialist Party Club Number 1 in New York City in 1910, resigned in 1912, partly in response to the racism of the Party. In 1913, DuBois wrote in the *New Review* that "theoretical socialism of the twentieth century meets a critical dilemma in facing up to the problems of racism."

During the first two decades of its existence the only thing that the SP produced in the way of literature on blacks was a short pamphlet by Charles Vail, *Socialism and the Negro Problem*. As expected, Vail came to the conclusion that the answer to black needs was socialism, nothing else. This utter failure on the part of the early American Socialists to understand the complexities of black life led to their eventual demise as a force in American society. As late as 1932, the SP was still rejecting motions for black equality.

One of the positive things that did emerge out of the SP was the publication of *Messenger* magazine in Harlem under the editorship of Chandler Owens and A. Philip Randolph. Owens and Randolph were then functioning members of the SP.

Founded in 1917, the *Messenger* took the position that capitalism was the basic cause of racism, labor division, and exploitation. The *Messenger* called for the socialization of industry, the nationalization of land, and the elimination of economic individualism through social revolution. The *Messenger* supported the attempts of black workers to organize themselves into separate unions. In 1917, Owens and Randolph organized the "United Brotherhood of Elevator and Switchboard Operators" for the purpose of obtaining better job conditions for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

black operators in New York. In 1920, Owens and Randolph formed a group known as the "Friends of Negro Freedom." This was to serve as a national organization for black unions. They also established the Independent Political Council, for the purpose of waging campaigns among Harlem blacks for Socialist political candidates.[4]

The realities of the black experience finally caught up with them too, in the 1920s, when Garvey's movement outstripped their leadership. Garvey was able to tap the large wellspring of national consciousness in the black masses to build his following, while Owens and Randolph could not.

After their subsequent split, Randolph in 1925 joined the struggle to organize the Pullman porters on the railroads. Thereafter Randolph began to backslide; on nearly every position he had previously taken he began to compromise. Rather than steering an independent course with his porters' union, he actively sought its incorporation into the American Federation of Labor.

The Communist Party, which was formed in 1919 out of a split in the ranks of the Socialists, seemed determined not to make the same errors regarding blacks as the old SP. After much debate, it began to accept the new interpretations which Lenin developed on imperialism, colonialism, and movements of Third World peoples.

Lenin, of course, succeeded in making significant refinements on Marx's and Engels' treatment of the national question. After a considerable amount of study, Lenin drew the conclusion: "A distinction must necessarily be made between the nationalism of an oppressor nation and that of an oppressed nation, the nationalism of a big nation and that of a small nation."[5] In order, according to Lenin, to insure the national liberation struggle of oppressed people, it was essential that the world proletariat supply as much aid and support as possible. To Lenin, a Marxist could not claim title to the term if he did not help by any means at his disposal the national struggles for self-determination.

Lenin did not look upon this demand as simply an exercise in rhetoric. He diligently attempted to apply the theory of self-determination in Russia after the October Revolution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finland was allowed to secede, and separate peace treaties were negotiated with the Baltic states. The Soviet Government also proposed establishing "a federation of the Soviet national republics."[6] As a result, a number of autonomous republics (included here were Jewish national districts where Yiddish was the recognized language) and regions were established. Provisions were made to respect the language, culture, religion and customs of the national minorities.* Lenin waged an intense fight against what he labeled "Great-Russian Chauvinism." Later on, a Soviet of Nationalities, composed of deputies from all the nationalities, was organized and given parity with the powerful Soviet of the Union.[7]

In an earlier unfinished study on world nationalities, Lenin observed: "In the United States, only 11.1 per cent of the population consists of Negroes (and also mulattoes and Indians) who must be considered an oppressed nation. . . ."[8] Taking its cue from Lenin's ideas and practices, and following Stalin's definition of a nation (common language, territory, economic life, and culture), the CP issued a draft resolution "On the Negro Question in the United States" in 1928. In the resolution the CP declared the black-belt area of the South an oppressed nation and called for self-determination. Though the idea was short-lived, it did signal a shift in the way Marxists

* Similarly, in China, where more than forty million people or 6 percent of the total population belong to minority groups, Mao adhered to a similar policy on the national question. Previous to the revolution, the ruling classes in China usually were drawn from the Han majority. They pushed the notion of "Great Han Chauvinism" in their dealings with national minorities. After the final seizure of state power in 1949, the Chinese Communist Party quickly set about the task of changing the status of the country's nationalities. Josef Kolmas in his study of minority nationalities in China states: "The situation was changed with the founding of the Chinese People's Republic in 1949. Minorities officially gained equal status, the right of local self-government, and freedom to develop their languages and life. . . . Regional autonomy is the basic policy which the government has adopted in its approach to the national problem. According to the Chinese Constitution, autonomy is to be exercised in areas where national minorities live in compact communities. In all other cases the electoral system is so arranged that they have suitable representation in local governments. Today, there are five autonomous, self-governing regions in China, and sixty-five smaller groupings known as autonomous counties." (Josef Kolmas, "The Minority Nationalities," in Ruth Adams, ed., *Contemporary China* [New York: Vintage Books, 1968].)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

began to view the black struggle. For the first time, black nationality was recognized, at least verbally.

II

As Garvey seemed to understand, there is a deep desire among blacks for a national existence. This feeling stems directly from the oppressive nature of black existence. As it stood, the Leninist concept of self-determination, as interpreted by the CP in the late 1920s, represented a significant step forward. However, placed in the context of the Afro-American situation, it became to some extent little more than the imposition by whites from above on blacks of a program which the black workers and sharecroppers of the South had no part in formulating. For it to have been completely within the confines of the Leninist ideal, the blacks there would have to have been consulted by some method to find out exactly what their views were on the question.

Further, Afro-America is in every sense a colonial appendage of white America. Blacks are not just discriminated against, they suffer national oppression. The oppressor is not simply the white ruling class but white America, including a large segment of its workers who have directly benefited from this national oppression. James Boggs in *Racism and the Class Struggle,* Harold Cruse in *Rebellion or Revolution?,* and Robert L. Allen in *Black Awakening in Capitalist America* all make this point clear. The super-exploitation of the Third World by Western imperialism has brought material comforts to certain select layers of the white working class in America. This has served, along with the added factors of consumerism and technology, to incorporate them into the enlarged corporate structure. The gigantic propaganda role of the mass-media (particularly television) has solidified this relationship. The standard theories of "labor aristocracy," union misleadership and corruption, bureaucratic domination, and fear of competition for jobs from blacks, have validity in explaining why blacks are hated by white labor in the unskilled and semi-skilled positions. This does not, however, explain why the relatively privileged skilled trade workers are the most vehement in their opposition to blacks. This is the job area into which blacks have the least chance of enter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing. So all of these factors mentioned have gone into the formation of a corporate-privileged white-worker linkage which Marx in nineteenth-century England could not foresee; and Lenin in early twentieth-century Russia only partially anticipated.

Another factor which led to many mistakes by the SP and the early CP was their inability to analyze properly the class divisions in the structure of black America. They assumed that blacks were one monolithic unit in the area of aspirations and goals. It was, and still is to a degree, thought by many Marxists that all blacks either were workers or possessed "working-class consciousness." Although blacks do suffer all-class oppression by virtue of white racism, blacks have never had one "proletarian mind." Class cleavages have always existed among blacks. As a result of automation, mechanization, and the overall changing complexion of American society, the "street brothers" now form a black underclass. Permanently unemployed, this group has been completely pushed out of the job market. As a consequence, they have not fitted into any Marxian formulation for social change.

Conversely, the black professional core of doctors, lawyers, teachers, etc., has joined with the black business segment of small owners and shopkeepers to form, over the years, a small but vocal black elite. This elite has wielded enormous influence and control over the affairs of the black community.[9] Marxists have always encountered great hostility from this elite when attempting to organize among blacks. The clash between the NAACP and the CP is an example that Wilson Record examines in *Race and Radicalism.*

Even more, in the early years of the twentieth century, the black elite nearly always opposed the organization of blacks into unions. They were not only against the white trade unions (which at least one could understand, because of their racism), but they were against black unions as well. Spero and Harris, in *The Black Worker,* relate:

> The attempt to organize the Pullman porters has been fought by Negro editors, ministers, and politicians with the same vigor as attempts to organize the colored workers in the stockyards or coal mines. Here there was no question of the duplicity of white labor. The Pullman porters were a Negro union organized and led by Negroes. Yet the Negro leaders cautioned their people not to fight their friend the Pullman Company.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A correct analysis, then, shows that although there is a recognizable class structure among blacks, it is far less consequential than that of white America. This is mainly due to the fact that there has not been the long-term private industrial development among blacks which results in the rise of rigid class structures. So, because the great majority of blacks are a product of the working class there has usually been much more room for fruitful coalitions among black groups than with any section of whites—both because of common class and common race. Claude McKay, noted black writer who was active in the early socialist movement, observed that

> it seems to me that if Negroes were organized as a group and as workers, whatever work they are doing (with or without the whites), and were thus getting a practical education in the nature and the meaning of the labor movement, it might even be more important and worthwhile than for them to become members of radical political parties.[10]

Throughout its history, organized labor (with the possible exception of the early period of the CIO) has been viciously hostile toward blacks. Because of the almost universal exclusion of blacks from the skilled trade unions, blacks, as mentioned before, have often found it expedient to organize into separate unions. The following are a few examples: the Colored Electricians' Union, the International Order of Colored Firemen, the Negro Labor Congress, the American Trades Council, the Longshoremen's Protective Union Benevolent Association, and the National Association of Afro-American Steam and Gas Engineers.

One of the most important of these black unions was the National Brotherhood Workers of America, organized by R. T. Sims in 1919. Sims saw the Brotherhood as a body which would adhere to "sound union principles" and follow "militant revolutionary methods."[11] Most of the union's membership came from the black dock workers in eastern Virginia. For a time, Sims aligned his organization with the *Messenger* radicals, and Owens and Randolph became members of his union's board of directors. Though shortlived, the Brotherhood showed the possibilities of successfully organizing blacks in basic industries around class-national demands. Sims, himself an early black Socialist, later became quite active as an IWW organizer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Because of the pervasive racism in the trade union structure, black and white labor unity has never been an accomplished fact for any length of time in America. The extreme resistance of white construction workers in Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Seattle to black demands for jobs underscores this. As DuBois noted a half-century ago:

> Theoretically we are a part of the world proletariat in the sense that we are mainly an exploited class of cheap laborers; but practically we are not a part of the white proletariat and are not recognized by that proletariat to any great extent. We are the victims of their physical oppression, social ostracism, economic exclusion, and personal hatred; and when in self-defense we seek sheer subsistence we are howled down as scabs.[12]

At present, the independent organization of black workers remains central to the ultimate success of the black liberation movement. In today's America, black workers are the key to the entire production system. In a recent interview, Ken Cockrel, of the League of Revolutionary Black Workers in Detroit,* stated:

> Do you know that the Tank Arsenal which makes the majority of tanks for the U.S. Army in this country is located at Nine Mile and Mound and that 90 percent of the workers in that particular installation are black! What do you think were rolling down the streets July 23, 1967 (during Detroit's black rebellion), and are rolling around Vietnam today?[13]

In fact, with few exceptions, many of today's black "spokesmen" have not even recognized the importance of unifying black workers at the very point of production. Not since the late thirties and forties have black radicals attempted the formation of black labor groups around working class demands. As Harry Haywood, black CP organizer, wrote:

---

* It should be pointed out that the League recognizes the need for the black working class to adopt a Marxist-Leninist orientation. Toward this end, the League has proclaimed itself a Black Marxist-Leninist Party. Its program calls for: the broad organization of black workers; educating blacks to the nature of racism, capitalism, and imperialism; development of a collective black economic base; self-defense; and principled alliances with those oppressed people (including whites) who are struggling against the American system of oppression.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Negro working class is a class with independent political expression and aims directed to active and uncompromising struggle against imperialism. The emergence of this class as an independent political factor marks the appearance of two tendencies within the Negro liberation movement: one which wants to come to terms with the Negroes' oppressors and the other which, under the leadership of the Negro working class, struggles against imperialism.[14]

On other issues, black unity, as Brother Malcolm X continually emphasized, is not only desirable but essential. The key difference is that the basis of this unity must be established on the needs of the black masses first. To insure this, it is obviously necessary for the black masses to exercise leadership over every phase of the black movement.[15] The growth of grass-roots organizations such as welfare rights, black community coalitions, black consumer-boycott groups, etc., around the country is a positive sign of this development.

This unity is even more vital when one considers that the black community is presently undergoing stepped-up attacks. The ghetto rebellions, the shootings at Jackson State and Augusta, the assaults on the Panthers, not to mention the daily harassment of and brutality towards blacks, are evidence that the black community must relate to armed self-defense *as a community.*

III

The biggest single thing which has blunted much of the impact of the class struggle in America has been racism. It has become so deeply rooted in the American cultural experience that the Marxian analysis, which attributes it to capitalism and the bourgeois class structure, is only partly accurate today. There is little question that the origins of white racism are found in the materialism of the European slave trade, and the economic competition traditionally fostered by the American ruling class between black and white workers. However, over the decades racism has developed a separate character and taken on new dimensions. Racism so pervades the American

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

psyche that most whites, particularly "liberals" and "radicals,"* are not even aware of it.

Racism has become rooted in the cultural fabric of America. Intertwined within the superstructure of white society, racism is now as much a question of attitudes as institutions. Even today, many Marxists tend to see only the objective manifestations of racism while completely overlooking its subjective appearances in the life-styles of all American whites. This is such a complex issue that even most blacks do not realize its depths. One of the weaknesses in the otherwise valuable works of Boggs and Allen is that they do not deal adequately with the psycho-social components of racism.

The question then becomes: "Is socialism *by itself* a sufficient remedy for eliminating attitudinal racism?" The little available evidence indicates that the answer is no. In Cuba, where socialist revolution has occurred and where racism was not nearly as ingrained as in America, there are still surviving elements of prejudice against the Afro-Cuban. Carlos Moore, an Afro-Cuban writer, several years ago in an article in *Présence Africaine* ("Cuba: The Untold Story"), detailed exactly how racism still persists in the national life of Cuba. It must immediately be pointed out, though, that Cuba has made progress as a result of the Revolution in eliminating the negative effects of three centuries of slavery, capitalism, and racism.

Going further, a great deal of hypocrisy is exhibited by some Marxist groups on the question of racism. On the one hand, they acknowledge the fact that blacks are the most oppressed and exploited segment of American society and are therefore the vanguard of the American revolution. On the other hand, these groups, with few exceptions, have no blacks in dominant positions of leadership. This seems unfortunate, for one of the most effective ways to fight racism among whites is for them to accept black leadership and control. This is a

* Pettis Perry, in an article in *Political Affairs* (June 1946), noted that racism was a glaring reality within the CP itself. According to Perry, white party members had done the following: signed restrictive covenant agreements, arbitrarily removed blacks from local Party posts, refused to affiliate with blacks in some branches, segregated education classes, punished blacks severely for violations, whereas whites committing similar offenses were not bothered.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary step. Whites, in general, have never been accustomed to taking orders from blacks, or having decisions made for them by blacks. It has always been the other way around. To combat subjective racism, it is essential that the roles be entirely reversed for a period of time. A black liberation commission or a black caucus within a left organization that deals with black affairs only is not a suitable substitute.

The greatest distance between Marxism and black nationalism appears to exist on the level of black culture. Without adequately studying all of the practical aspects of Marxism and coming to their own independent conclusions, most black cultural nationalists tend to repudiate Marxism. Their arguments seem to be those advanced by many bourgeois African theoreticians. For example, at a conference of black writers and artists held in Rome in 1959, a group of African "Marxists" led by Aimé Cesaire passed a resolution which read in part:

> (1) The cultural references in Marx's thought are nearly all drawn from Western experience;
> (2) The economic situation of the Western proletariat cannot be strictly identified with that of the underdeveloped people;
> (3) A doctrine is all the more universal so far as, on the one hand, it takes into account all experience, historic, economic, etc., and the diversity of the cultural genius of peoples, and, on the other hand, its application is controlled by a really representative authority. . . .[16]

As the resolution correctly states, Marxism is an initial product of the Western experience. This does not mean, however, that it is a totally alien force beside the socio-cultural traditions of Afro-America. Only through future struggle will blacks learn for certain which aspects of Marxism can be used and which must be discarded. For it is only through the people's struggles, as Frantz Fanon noted, that a genuine black culture can be realized.

Progressive black nationalism, then, holds much promise as an ideology for uniting blacks around their most immediate problems. Marxian internationalism is first and foremost realized in a national context (China, Cuba, Russia, etc.). The nation is the basic unit in an oppressed people's struggle for reconstruction. The national liberation movements from Vietnam to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Guinea-Bissau are ample evidence of this. Currently, the main contradiction is not between the ruling class and the working classes in the West; but between the West (including its privileged white workers) and the Third World, black workers in America included.

Self-determination and control, vital ingredients for community development, are the present concerns of the black masses. In effect, this means that the black struggle is primarily one of race and class. From this perspective, the debate over integration vs. separation is largely a waste of time. Mass black integration into the American structure is impossible; while separation is, as it has always been, a reality. The only thing that remains to be discussed are the methods to be used to build viable and responsive black community institutions capable of meeting basic black needs. And even this must be seen as only a means; the end must be the complete transformation of American capitalist society.

Both Lenin and Mao have expressly pointed to the national struggle as being an intimate part of the class struggle, and it must always be considered as such. So, for example, when dealing with the land question, it is not enough for blacks to acquire land. They must also have the means to develop it. Simple ownership means little. Blacks must have complete collective control over the means of production. If this is not the case then the land is either rendered useless and non-productive or becomes prey for neo-colonial exploitation. This is what is happening all over Africa today.

Similarly, more blacks are beginning to see through the hoax of black capitalism and the bourgeois nationalist program of "Buy Black." Some have begun seriously to think about programs for anti-capitalist economic development. This, of course, has limited value if seen as a transitional goal only. For in the context of advanced corporate America, the existence of any type of independent black enterprise is an impossibility.

Finally, just as in Africa where new theories of struggle have been presented by thinkers such as Nkrumah, Touré, Cabral, Fanon, and Nyerere,[17] blacks in America must continue to seek creative new concepts to deal with their oppression. Liberation for blacks will come out of the revolutionary cul-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture, consciousness, and experiences of Afro-America. The utilization of Marxism-Leninism as a scientific tool of analysis certainly poses no contradictions when strictly applied to the unique conditions of blacks.

NOTES

1. Horace Davis, *Nationalism and Socialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967), p. 65.
2. For a fuller discussion see *Karl Marx on Colonialism and Modernization,* Shlomo Avineri, ed. (New York: Anchor Books, 1969).
3. William Z. Foster, *The Negro People in American History* (New York: International Publishers, 1954), p. 401.
4. Sterling D. Spero and Abram L. Harris, *The Black Worker* (New York: Atheneum, 1968).
5. V. I. Lenin, *The Awakening of Asia* (*Selected Essays*), (New York: International Publishers, 1968), p. 64.
6. V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works in Twelve Volumes* (London, 1946), vol. 6, p. 452.
7. N. N. Agarwal, *Soviet Nationalities Policy* (Agra: Sri Ram Mehra & Co., 1969).
8. Quoted in Theodore Draper, *American Communism and Soviet Russia* (New York: Viking Press, 1960), p. 336.
9. E. Franklin Frazier, "The Negro Middle Class and Desegregation," *Social Problems,* 4 (April 1957). Frazier points out: "Middle-class Negroes have always taken a lead in the struggle of Negroes for equality in American life, they have always respected and supported the basic American values."
10. Claude McKay, *A Long Way From Home* (New York: Arno Press, 1968).
11. Spero and Harris, *The Black Worker,* p. 117.
12. *Crisis* (August, 1931), p. 151.
13. Ken Cockrel (interview), "Detroit's League Speaks," Liberation News Service (Aug. 8, 1970).
14. Harry Haywood, *Negro Liberation* (New York: International Publishers, 1948), p. 204.
15. W. E. B. DuBois, "Negroes and the Crisis of Capitalism in the U.S.," MONTHLY REVIEW (April 1953). This article reflects DuBois's changing conception of the black struggle. Here he comes out strongly for mass black (worker) leadership to head the fight for socialism.
16. For the full text of the resolution see, Colin Legum's *Pan-Africanism* (New York: Praeger, 1965).
17. Julius Nyerere's *Uhuru Na Ujamaa* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968) gives an excellent analysis of the application of socialism in Tanzania.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOW AVAILABLE

One of the most important documents of the 20th-century revolution on the American continents

Pierre Vallières' WHITE NIGGERS OF AMERICA
The Precocious Autobiography of a Quebec "Terrorist"

Translated by Joan Pinkham

Available heretofore only in scarce and repeatedly banned French editions, this book has already assumed a place alongside the writings of Malcolm X, Debray, Cleaver, and Guevara. It is an extraordinarily sensitive autobiography, a history of Quebec, a personal credo, and a revolutionary program, as well as one of the finest pieces of writing produced by modern radicalism.

Vallières was one of the founders of the reorganized Front de Libération du Québec. In 1966, he and Charles Gagnon went to the United States to publicize the Quebec liberation struggle, and were arrested as they demonstrated in front of the U.N. *White Niggers of America* was written in the N.Y. House of Detention between October 1966 and February 1967, and a final chapter was written in Montreal Jail in 1969. After three years in prison, Vallières and Gagnon won their release, only to be seized again in the fall of 1970.

Just past thirty, Vallières is one of the young men of revolution, and his outlook both reflects and has helped to shape the views of the New Left. Suspicious and critical of traditional orthodoxies, he has taken more from Guevara than from Lenin, his internationalism is proudly tinged with French-Canadian nationalism, his approach to revolutionary ideas is personal and immediate. He has provided in this account of his own evolution a wealth of unvarnished reflections which will be of immense help to the revolutionary movement in clarifying its purposes and goals.

Canadian purchasers: McClelland and Stewart Ltd. (25 Hollinger Road, Toronto 374) will be publishing this book in April. Therefore, Monthly Review Press does not have the right to sell it in Canada (not even to MR Associates). Please order from McClelland and Stewart.

CL1745 $7.50/£3.40

50% discount for MR Associates. Enclose payment with order, add sales tax where applicable.

Monthly Review Press 116 West 14th Street, N.Y., N.Y. 10011
33/37 Moreland Street, London, E.C. 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OKINAWA IN THE AMERICAN EMPIRE

BY MARK SELDEN

The Ryukyus, surrounded on three sides by major powers of East Asia, are the most strategic outposts of freedom in the Far East. Known as the "Keystone of the Pacific," Okinawa, the most important island, is 800 nautical miles southwest of Tokyo, 325 nautical miles northeast of Taipei, 750 nautical miles northeast of Manila, and 700 nautical miles northeast of Hong Kong.

Thus observes a brief survey of the geography of Okinawa in the official 1969 *Facts Book* of the U.S. High Commissioner of the Ryukyus. Delicately left unstated is the fact that the nerve center of America's mammoth Pacific military network is also less than 1,500 miles—convenient bomber and missile striking range—from the capitals of North Vietnam and China and from the major cities of the Soviet Far East. This strategic location has led the United States to turn Okinawa into the greatest armed fortress of the Pacific.

The grand conception of American hegemony in the Pacific was stated well by General MacArthur in 1949:

Now the Pacific has become an Anglo-Saxon lake and our line of defense runs through the chain of islands fringing the coast of Asia. It starts from the Philippines and continues through the

---

Mark Selden, a member of the History Department at Washington University, St. Louis, has recently returned from Japan. His article brings up to date an earlier one, "The Shame of Okinawa," by James Diamond in the December 1963 issue of MR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ryukyu archipelago which includes its main bastion, Okinawa. Then it bends back through Japan and the Aleutian Island chain to Alaska.[1]*

But it was the eruption of the Korean War the following year which permanently established Okinawa's worth to a generation of American strategists whose focus had begun to shift to Asia. As Okinawa-based B-29 Superfortresses rained destruction over North and South Korea and the islands became the major supply and logistical base for American forces, a vast program of base expansion was initiated. In 1950 Okinawa assumed its critical forward role in the American confrontation with China.

One price exacted for the 1951 peace treaty ending Japan's postwar occupation was the perpetuation of direct colonial rule over Okinawa, insuring the United States a free hand to exploit its military potential. In the 1960s, as nuclear stalemates with the Soviet Union shifted the preoccupation of American strategists to counterinsurgency, Okinawa's role loomed still larger. As President Kennedy observed in March 1962: "Our bases in the Ryukyu Islands help us assure our allies in the great arc from Japan through Southeast Asia not only of our willingness but also of our ability to come to their assistance in case of need."[2] Within a few short years Okinawa surpassed Kennedy's highest expectations. As the Vietnam War was rapidly escalating, the August 30, 1965 *Newsweek* reported on military operations in that "strategic keystone"

which has become one vast supply dump, training ground and advanced staging area for U.S. forces in the Far East. Virtually every item in America's mighty arsenal—from jungle knives to nuclear weapons—is stored here. Kadena Air Force base, just north of Naha, is one of the world's busiest airports, handling 10,000 landings and take-offs per month. Attack transports and other Navy vessels steam endlessly in and out of White Beach harbor. Camps, firing ranges, and supply depots are scattered the length and breadth of the island, and the roads are clogged with jeeps and olivedrab troop trucks. Guerrilla-warfare specialists train in the island's steamy jungles, and Army and Marine units maneuver in battalion strength on the ridges, beaches, and coral-

* Notes will be found at the end of the article.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

encrusted flatlands. And somewhere on Okinawa are four launching sites for Mace B nuclear missiles [subsequently identified, though never officially acknowledged, at Yomitan, Katsuren, Kin, and Onnan villages] which, with a range of 1,200 miles can easily reach into Communist China.

America's $2-billion military complex on Okinawa was soon to become much busier. With 14,000 air operations a month logged on its 12,000-foot parallel runaways, by 1968 Kadena Air Base had become the major launching site for B-52 bombing raids which have laid waste North and South Vietnam.[3] Nor were the Marines idle. Their 40,000-acre training grounds include vast areas of "rugged, heavily vegetated jungle" which afford

an excellent opportunity to become acclimated to the sort of terrain found throughout Southeast Asia and in other tropical areas of the world. This is the location of the Marine Counter-Guerrilla Warfare School which teaches the latest, tested techniques of guerrilla fighting in a jungle environment. Instruction given here includes the technique of conducting a search-and-seize operation in primitive villages.[4]

Finally, as the port of call for nuclear submarines and more recently for giant C-5A air transports, as the storage base for poison gas and other secret weapons, and as the source of Voice of America broadcasts to China, Okinawa, with its 50,000 men in uniform, assumed a pivotal role in America's military advance into Asia.

But Okinawa is not only military bases and hardware vital to the perpetuation of America's Asian empire. It is also the home of nearly one million people who have lived for 25 years under American colonial rule. What has been the record of "democratization and modernization" in the major area of direct American administration in the postwar era? Here if anywhere, unimpeded by the vagaries and vested interests of reactionary native elites, American ideals of progress and development would surely flourish. As the United States has publicly declared its intention to return Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty in 1972 (while maneuvering simultaneously to strengthen and insure the perpetuation of its military bases), the time has come to assess the record of Okinawa's colonial era.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the beginning, according to the *Omore,* Okinawa's own Book of Genesis, there was chaos. But through the intervention of Tedo-Ke, the Sun God, this chaos was resolved into land and sea, the first land being a tiny island several miles from what is now southeastern Okinawa. There two demigods performed monumental labors, carrying stone and sand and earth, hewing rock, planting trees and arresting the floods which regularly inundated the island. . . .

Substitute the chaos of war which left behind a land ruined both physically and economically, and put the United States Army in the place of the pair of legendary demigods; have that Army exert monumental efforts of very much the same nature; and finally have it introduce a new democratic form of government and you have an almost literal modern-day parallel to the ancient story of creation as told in Luchuan mythology.

Unlike the demigods, however, the Army is not leaving the populace to create order out of chaos with meager or inadequate resources. This time the Okinawans are being taught new skills and new ways of life as the Army works to transform the island into a veritable keystone of the Pacific while rebuilding the overall economy of the entire archipelago.[5]

In June of 1853, Commodore Perry, astride a red and blue draped sedan chair, led a company of marines on a forced march to the Okinawan royal palace. But Perry's demands, including the right to establish a military base, proved premature. President Pierce refused to support his commodore, observing that "if, in the future, resistance should be offered and threatened, it would also be rather mortifying to surrender the island, if once seized, and rather inconvenient and expensive to maintain a force there to retain it."[6]

Almost a century later, the United States returned in force. This time they taught the Okinawan people, whose homeland had never known a major armed conflict, the meaning of modern war. In a three-month campaign that left much of the islands a sea of flame and decimated its population, an American fighting force of more than 250,000 men broke the back of the Japanese military machine. The battle for Okinawa, the final struggle of the Pacific War, was also the most costly in lives. Heavily outnumbered and facing overwhelming firepower, Japanese and Okinawan defenders resisted bitterly for more than two months in the face of massive air and sea bombardment. U.S. army figures place the final toll at 49,151 American casual-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties including 12,520 dead, against 110,071 listed as "enemy dead."[7]

American military histories of the campaign treat the Okinawan population as a minor, if occasionally irritating, intruder in the heroic drama of American military prowess. Nevertheless, glimpses emerge of the horrifying destruction of human life:

> Civilians became a nuisance to combat units after the assault on the final enemy lines began, and remained a burden until front lines no longer existed. More than 10,000 civilians stayed on Chinen Peninsula and were relatively unharmed by the battle. A much larger number, forced south by the advancing lines, hid in caves or stone huts until they were overtaken. Then they tried to pass through the machine-gun and shell fire to enter American lines or attempted the even more hazardous feat of slipping through the front lines during darkness. . . .
>
> Eighty thousand Okinawa civilians, between a third and a half of whom were wounded, crawled from caves at the south tip of the island during the last two weeks of June. These were either children, the very old, or women; there were few able-bodied men among them. In long columns they walked toward the rear. . . . The bodies of many thousands of other civilians lay scattered in the ditches, in the canefields, and in the rubble of the villages, or were sealed in caves.[8]

And these were but a fraction of an estimated 350,000 thrust from their homes and land into stockades and detention centers for the duration of the campaign.[9] In the end, an estimated 100,000 Okinawan civilians may have died with as many more wounded. Okinawan economy and society were destroyed, eventually to be resurrected, but this time in the image of the American military. Since 1945 the Okinawan people have been the victims of American military ambitions: as nuclear hostages —the islands are prime targets in the event of global conflict; as economic hostages—the economic life of Okinawa is lashed to the military base complex; as political hostages—Okinawans are forced to live under the colonial domination of the American military.

In short, Okinawa represents a classic example of the predominance of military and strategic considerations in charting the course of American colonial rule. In the bland phraseology of the *Facts Book*, "The mission of the United States Civil Administration of Ryukyu Islands is to assure that this strategic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

area will contribute most effectively to the peace and security of the free world." Behind official rhetorical flourishes, trumpeting concern for Okinawan democracy and prosperity, American administrators have consistently acted to strengthen the islands' military potential to the detriment of its people. Okinawa's "civil administration" is in fact directly controlled by the Pentagon which appoints the High Commissioner, in all cases a ranking general. While Okinawans are tutored in democracy through the ritualistic election of a legislature and executive, the American High Commissioner retains absolute control over the islands. The High Commissioner, the *Facts Book* records, may

> if such action is deemed by him to be important in its effect, direct or indirect, on the security of the Ryukyu Islands, or on relations with foreign countries and international organizations with respect to the Ryukyu Islands, or on the foreign relations of the United States, or on the security, property, or interests of the United States, or nationals thereof . . ., in respect of Ryukyuan bills, laws or officials, as the case may be, (1) veto any bill or any part or portion thereof, (2) annul any law or any part or portion thereof within 45 days after its enactment, and (3) remove any public official from office. . . . The High Commissioner may assume in whole or in part, the exercise of full authority in the islands, if such an assumption of authority appears mandatory for security reasons.

In short, Okinawan democracy is a puppet show in which a powerless people is hypocritically manipulated by its military masters. But it is not merely in the realm of electoral politics that democracy is a sham. In the entire range of institutions, from a dual system of justice which shields Americans from convictions for crimes against the Okinawan people,[10] to the long-standing ban on such elementary civil liberties as the right of labor unions to strike, we find the stamp of direct military exploitation.

Nowhere is this pattern of military hegemony more clear-cut than in the economy. *The Oriental Economist* in its January 1970 feature on Okinawa summed it up this way:

> Okinawa has for more than two decades since the war been segregated from Japan and its economy is completely subservient to the U.S. dollar because of overwhelming dependence on United States military base operations. . . . Described in the simplest terms, the economy of Okinawa is a "military-base economy."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Okinawan economy is not merely tied to the American dollar which is the official currency. ("Liberty" and "In God We Trust" go to market with every peasant villager.) Virtually the entire economy exists to service the U.S. military.

We have already observed the first and critical steps in the militarization of the economy. In the Battle for Okinawa and its aftermath, hundreds of thousands of peasants were driven from their land. A U.S. Congressional Investigating Committee sent to Okinawa to investigate the land problem in 1955 found that over 250,000 Okinawan peasants had been displaced. More than 20 percent of the arable land (the percentage was much higher in populous central Okinawa) was turned into a sea of cement airstrips, training grounds, and missile installations.[11] The result was to destroy in one swift blow the livelihood and way of life of rural Okinawa, to cripple agriculture and force heavy dependence on American food imports. Under these conditions, the single option for survival (one is reminded of American forced draft "urbanization" in Vietnam) was to work for the military.

The humiliation and dependency characteristic of colonial status have taken on a singular brutality in Okinawa. Outside of combat zones where Third World peoples have risen to destroy the colonial yoke, nowhere is the foreign military presence so overwhelming as in Okinawa. Nowhere is the landscape so dominated by barbed-wire military bases, guarded airstrips, and barracks alternating with the garish symbols of the American military life-style abroad—golf courses, swimming pools, servicemen's clubs, and dependent housing—a parody of Los Angeles suburbia on the one hand, and its Watts counterpart, the Bush, the all-black ghetto steaming under the racism for which the military on Okinawa is notorious. On Okinawa the silken glove of a superior colonial culture carried by administrators, businessmen, missionaries, and teachers scarcely conceals the mailed fist of the military.

For the average GI, just back from or on his way to 'Nam, the Okinawan population exists to provide him with pleasure. Above all, this means sex. The pure power of American wealth has produced a whole new subculture, utterly alien to traditional mores, in which the daughters of farming and fishing villages

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

don scarlet dresses to act out the tortured fantasies of pimply-faced American teenagers in khaki. Perhaps the ultimate expression of imperialist power lies in forcing its victims to conform to the grotesque patterns of the repressed lusts of the conqueror. The combination of degradation and dependency is rooted in the new economic order which the Americans have brought to Okinawa.

The U.S. administration has developed power, water, and transport facilities to create an economic infrastructure geared to maximizing the island's military potential. Inevitably Okinawan interests have been sacrificed in the process. Twenty-five years after the coming of the Americans, economic life continues to revolve around the military and other appendages of the colonial presence. One-sixth of the entire work force is directly employed by the military (40,000 workers) and government (34,000). And this is but a fraction of those forced to live off the American presence. There are an estimated 15,000 to 25,000 prostitutes and bar girls, more than 10,000 maids employed by servicemen alone (all officers and many enlisted men have servants, a luxury made possible by the depressed Okinawan wage scale). Tens of thousands of others work in the wide range of subsidiary industries and services which cater to American pleasures.

Despite the Vietnam War-inspired economic boom—the expenditures of the military jumped from $118 million in 1964 to $197 million by 1967—the Okinawan people remain locked in the grip of poverty.[12] Per capita income in fiscal year 1967 was $588, barely sixty percent of the Japanese average. The 17¢ per hour average wage the U.S. government and military paid its Okinawan employees in 1955 had of course risen—along with inflation. By January 1968 these employees averaged a munificent 71¢ per hour including bonuses, still well below the salary scale of base workers in Japan proper.[13]

The overwhelming dependence of the Okinawan economy on U.S. military expenditures is graphically revealed in the pattern of Okinawa trade, as shown in the table on page 43:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Trade, Gross National Product, and Expenditures of U.S. Forces[14]

(in millions of U.S. dollars)

Fiscal Year	Imports	Exports	Trade Balance	GNP	U.S. Forces Expenditures
1955	$ 51.2	10.7	–40.5	—	50.0
1960	116.8	24.0	–92.8	204.1	75.0
1965	210.7	79.4	–131.3	386.6	135.0
1968	373.7	87.4	–286.3	641.9	197.8
1969	371.6	87.5	–284.1	727.1	—

By fiscal year 1968 Okinawa's steadily mounting trade deficit had climbed to $286 million, more than 40 percent of its $641 million gross national product. The total value of exports throughout the period of American rule has consistently remained at a level which is barely 20 percent of imports, and indeed since 1965 has remained virtually stagnant, rising by only one percent annually. This massive deficit was balanced, could only be balanced, by the influx of U.S. dollars in the form of base expenditures and salaries, simultaneously balancing accounts and completing the circle of military dependence. The islanders are deprived of their richest land. Their power, resources, and transport facilities are channeled in the service of the military. Okinawan economic life develops as a parasitic appendage of the American military. Okinawans man the bases from which America wreaks destruction throughout Asia and staff a civil administration whose *raison d'être* is the continued subordination of Okinawans to American rule. Starvation is virtually the only alternative to degrading service in the direct employ of the American military, except of course becoming servants or prostitutes to its men in uniform.

The tragic dilemma of the Okinawan people has been highlighted during the past year by two unprecedented waves of strikes by Zengunro, the Okinawan military base workers union. Representing more than 20,000 base workers, Zengunro was organized in the face of severe official repression. American authorities refused to recognize its authority as a collective bargaining agent; strikes were illegal, and workers, particularly union troublemakers, could be fired by arbitrary military fiat. Indeed, the decision to fire several hundred base workers as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of Nixon's military retrenchment provided the immediate cause of the strikes which briefly crippled the functioning of the bases. Beginning in December 1969, a first wave of strikes directly challenged the arbitrary rule of the American military. The strikes represent a new level of Okinawan political consciousness. Zengunro workers have been fighting not only to protect the livelihood of their members; in conjunction with New Left forces in Japan and Okinawa *they have attacked the bases themselves*, challenging American military domination over Okinawan life and the use of their homeland as a staging area for the Vietnam war. The strikers have simultaneously demanded an end to Okinawa's base-ridden economy and society, including elimination of all U.S. military installations on the islands, while struggling to protect the only livelihood presently available to them—work on the bases.

The military is not the entire Okinawa story, however. During twenty-five years of colonial rule, American administrators have insured the iron grip of U.S. capital on the most lucrative sectors of the Okinawan economy. In the words of the January *Oriental Economist*: "In a nutshell, the Okinawa economy can be described as foreign controlled." We have already observed the effects of U.S. channeling of Okinawan resources as well as establishment of the dollar as official currency. In addition, the banking system is dominated by a combination of American government and private enterprises. Though latecomers to Okinawa, Bank of America and American Express have rapidly grown to assume positions of power in financial circles. But by far the most important bank on Okinawa is the official Ryukyu Bank, directly controlled by the U.S. administration, which holds more than 50 percent of its capital. With assets of $222.5 million on June 30, 1969, the Ryukyu Bank overshadows all other financial institutions.[15]

As of June 30, 1969, American investments of $222 million (exclusive of banking, insurance, and airlines) constituted the lion's share—better than 95 percent—of a total $233 million in foreign investments.[16] To be sure, these investments are dwarfed by American investments elsewhere. They nevertheless dominate key sectors of Okinawan economic life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In two industries, oil and aluminum, which tower above all others in the scale of investment, American multinational corporations have waged a fierce battle for control against their Japanese counterparts. Not surprisingly, the Americans have won in every instance. By early 1970 oil refinery investments by four American giants (Gulf, Caltex, Esso, and Kaiser Cement) overshadowed the entire American economic stake in Okinawa, and indeed far exceeded the annual budget of the Ryukyu Government ($170 million). In June 1970 the Ryukyu government rejected a plan by Japan's five leading aluminum firms in favor of Alcoa's proposal to invest $60 million in a 70,000-ton smeltery.[17] What is at stake ultimately for major U.S. firms rushing to establish a foothold in Okinawa is the desire to gain entry into lucrative Japanese markets. In establishing refineries and smelteries in Okinawa shortly before reversion, these companies seek a springboard to Japan and a means to evade iron-clad Japanese restrictions on foreign-controlled enterprises. For its part, the Japanese government has insisted that foreign firms on post-reversion Okinawa must conform to Japanese investment regulations—restricting foreign control of critical economic areas. The dance of the oil and aluminum conglomerates is just beginning—giant U.S. and Japanese firms in close coordination with their governments engage in intricate maneuvers and mergers as they seek to dominate the Okinawan market.

The record of foreign investment in Okinawa reveals classical features of colonial dependency and warped development. Investment by the colonizing power dominates the economy, particularly in critical areas attractive to the multinational giants. By contrast, Japan's $8-million investment is centered in sugar refining, pineapple canning, and hotels. The major flow of investment dollars is channeled into extractive industries, agriculture, and tourism, while industrial capacity is virtually nonexistent. Enterprises operated by Okinawans invariably lack the strength to compete with foreign firms, whether Japanese or American. The political and military dependency of the colonized people is mirrored in the economy.

While ensuring the hegemony of its military interests and safeguarding the primacy of American capital, the twenty-five

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year record of the colonial administration is one of cruelly and consistently sacrificing the interests of the Okinawan people. In place of the agrarian way of life destroyed by the U.S. occupying force, the only alternative livelihood has centered on catering to the U.S. military presence. The basic industrial infrastructure remains primitive, except for military logistics. Meanwhile, in anticipation of the reversion to Japan scheduled for 1972, the United States has already cut back aid to Okinawa for fiscal 1971 by over 300 percent to less than $7 million.

But is the United States really planning to return the "keystone of the Pacific" to Japanese sovereignty in 1972, and if so, under what terms? The stunning victory of the Liberal-Democratic Government in Japan's December 1969 elections was predicated on the widespread conviction that the United States would return Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty under the terms of the Sato-Nixon November communiqué. The key passage in that communiqué reads as follows:

> It was agreed that the mutual security interests of the United States and Japan could be accommodated within arrangements for the return of the administrative rights over Okinawa to Japan. They therefore agree that the two governments would immediately enter into consultation regarding specific arrangements for accomplishing the early reversion of Okinawa without detriment to the security of the Far East including Japan. They further agreed to expedite the consultations with a view to accomplishing the reversion during 1972 subject to the conclusion of these specific arrangements with the necessary legislative support. . . . The President and the Prime Minister agreed also that the United States would retain under the terms of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security such military facilities and areas in Okinawa as required in the mutual security of both countries.[18]

Penetrating the deliberate obfuscation of wording designed to pacify opposition forces in both the United States and Japan, several points emerge with clarity. The first, since amply confirmed in heavily censored U.S. Congressional testimony, is that whatever Japanese and Okinawan expectations were raised by the communiqué, the United States has *not* unalterably committed itself to 1972 reversion. Okinawa's return depends on hammering out acceptable terms for insuring "the security of the Far East," terms contingent on developments in the Indo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

China War and on the willingness of the Japanese government to permit the United States unfettered use of the bases—including nuclear weapons—following reversion.[19] Second, both the communiqué and subsequent actions make abundantly clear that the United States is implementing long-range plans to strengthen its military bases on Okinawa—regardless of reversion. Most significant in this respect is the recent announcement by the commander of Kadena Air Base of a $60-million expansion plan to be completed by 1976.[20] Whatever Okinawa's post-1972 administrative status, it will continue to play a critical role in American military ambitions in the Pacific. As in the case of America's formative colonial experience in the Philippines, the officially heralded end of direct rule finds the local population locked in the grip of dependency, degradation, and poverty, and the predominance of American strategic and economic interests assured.

NOTES

1. *New York Times,* March 2, 1949, quoted in Allen Whiting, *China Crosses the Yalu: The Decision to Enter the Korean War* (Stanford University Press, 1968), p. 39.
2. The High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, *Facts Book FY 1969,* United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands, APO San Francisco, 2-14.
3. *Okinawa Information Guide,* (Inteco: Naha, 1969), pp. 48-49. In recent months virtually all Okinawan-based B-52 raids have been shifted to Thailand, reducing the cost from $50,000 to $5,000 per run. Cf. John Dower, "Asia and the Nixon Doctrine: Ten Points of Note," *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* II, 4, November, 1970; UPI dispatch of August 24 in *Asahi Evening News,* August 25, 1970.
4. *Okinawa Information Guide,* pp. 52-53. The same source continues: "Instructors are sent to Vietnam frequently where they operate with front line units in a continuing effort to refine the instruction given and ensure that it is responsive to current needs."
5. Major General David Ogden, Commanding General Ryukyus Command, Deputy Governor of Ryukyu Islands, "Keystone of the Pacific," *Army Information Digest,* January 1954, pp. 52-53. Not every American spokesman has waxed as lyrical as General Ogden, yet American officials have repeatedly justified colonial rule of Okinawa in terms of its contributions to Okinawan welfare and the growth of democratic institutions.
6. George Kerr, *Okinawa, The History of an Island People* (Tokyo: Tuttle, 1959) p. 4. Also see pp. 297-341 concerning Perry's expedition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

7. The total estimated Japanese force was only 77,000, nevertheless the figure of 110,000 dead does not, as we will observe, include women, children and other noncombatants caught in the crossfire. Roy Appleman, James Burns, Russell Gugeler and John Stevens, *Okinawa: The Last Battle,* Historical Division, Department of the Army, Washington D.C., 1948, especially pp. 253-264, 384, 387, 473; Cf. Major Chas S. Nichols Jr., Henry I. Shaw, Jr., *Okinawa: Victory in the Pacific,* Historical Branch G-3 Division Headquarters U.S. Marine Corps, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1955.
8. Appleman et al., *Okinawa: The Last Battle,* p. 468.
9. Nichols and Shaw, *Okinawa: Victory,* p. 268.
10. The dual system of courts providing Americans with extra-territoriality is set forth in *Facts Book,* 2-8, 9. A typical instance of blatant disregard for crimes committed against Okinawans is related in *Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands, Report for Period 1 July 1967 to 30 June 1968,* High Commissioner of the Ryukyu Islands, p. 19: "The dependent daughter of a member of the U.S. Armed Forces was indicted for homicide, . . . tried (by the USCAR Superior Court) without a jury, found guilty and sentenced . . . to imprisonment for 1 year, suspended for 3 years. She was released to the custody of her mother and has departed the Ryukyus."
11. "Report of a Special Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, House of Representatives, Following an Inspection Tour October 14 to November 23, 1955," U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956, pp. 7651-7667. USCAR has been extremely secretive about American land-holding on Okinawa. No figures are given in the *Facts Book*; private estimates place the percent of arable land held by the U.S. as high as 46 percent on the main island; a recent Japanese government team despatched to investigate the land problem on Okinawa was refused access to official records. See *Japan Times,* July 3, 1970.
12. *Civil Administration of the Ryukyus, 1967-68,* p. 77.
13. *Facts Book,* 6-5, 12-1. Per capita income was officially reported as $745 for fiscal year 1969. A word on official statistics seems in order here. Particularly concerning politically sensitive issues such as salaries paid Okinawan employees of the military, they should be read with the same skepticism as an advertisement for a commercial product or a political candidate—they rarely err on the side of understatement. In citing these statistics, I assume that they present the most powerful—if not necessarily the most truthful—case for Okinawan progress under American colonial rule.
14. *Facts Book,* 10-1, 3, 5, 12-1; *Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands, 1967-68,* pp. 77, 81.
15. *Facts Book,* 13-7.
16. *Facts Book,* 10-8. The use of the dollar currency and investment regulations guarantee foreign investors a free hand in remitting capital and profits abroad.
17. "Okinawa Reversion—Economic Integration Problem," *Oriental Economist,* January 1970, pp. 16-21. *Facts Book,* 10-8. *Japan Times,* June 28, 1970.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

18. "Joint Statement by President Nixon and Prime Minister Sato Following Their Discussions in Washington, November 19-21, 1969." *Facts Book,* 2-25.
19. The release of the Symington Sub-Committee's January testimony on Okinawa precipitated a wave of shock and indignation in Japan and Okinawa. *Japan Times* banner headlines of August 25, 1970 were typical. "1972 Said Not Firm Date for Okinawa's Reversion to Japan," "Okinawans Shocked by Testimony." Cf. *Far Eastern Economic Review,* September 12, 1970, *New York Times,* August 15 and August 24, 1970.
20. *New York Times,* July 5, 1970; *Asahi Evening News,* August 20, 1970.

We have crushed a deceived and confiding people; we have turned against the weak and friendless who trusted us; we have invited our clean young men to shoulder a musket and do bandits' work under a flag which bandits have been accustomed to fear, not to follow.

—Mark Twain, on the invasion of the Philippines, 1901

All this country wants is to see its neighbors stable, orderly, and prosperous. Whichever of these countries whose people know how to behave themselves well can count on our cordial friendship. If a nation shows us that it knows how to act with efficiency and reasonable decency in social and political matters it does not have to suffer intervention from the United States.

—Theodore Roosevelt, 1904

The wise fools who sit in the high places of justice fail to see that in revolutionary times vital issues are settled not by statutes, decrees, and authorities but in spite of them.

—Helen Keller, 1919

Revolution is the only thing, the only power, that ever worked out freedom for any people. The powers that have ruled long, and learned to love ruling, will never give up that prerogative till they find they must, till they see the certainty of overthrow and destruction if they do not!

—Wendell Phillips, 1848

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spring paperbacks from Monthly Review Press

THE END OF WHITE WORLD SUPREMACY / MALCOLM X

Edited by Benjamin Goodman

Here collected for the first time are four important and previously unpublished speeches which cover the all-important final year of Malcolm's affiliation with the Black Muslims.

Included is "God's Judgment of White America," the speech which eventually led to the open break between Malcolm and Elijah Muhammad; "Black Man's History," which reveals Malcolm as he was accustomed to speak to an all-black Muslim audience; and, in fascinating contrast, "The Black Revolution," a speech given to an all-Christian audience. The fourth speech, "The Old Negro and the New Negro," is an eloquent plea for black pride and self-reliance.

$1.95/90p PB1702

ANARCHISM / DANIEL GUERIN

Introduction by Noam Chomsky

". . . what we have here is perhaps the best short introduction to anarchism there is."—*New Statesman.*

"Guérin's timely book will deservedly have wide appeal. It should remain for some time the best introduction to anarchism . . . a scholarly, vivid essay."—*Library Journal.*

". . . an able and well-organized account of the way in which anarchists, known and unknown, have grappled with social and industrial organization in a society, actual or envisaged, which does not depend on external coercion . . . conclusions are challenging."—*Times Educational Supplement* (London).

$2.45/£1.10 PB1753

ARMED STRUGGLE IN AFRICA / GERARD CHALIAND

". . . a thrilling book . . . the description of the activities of the liberation forces and of Amilcar Cabral's party is an admirable presentation of the why and how of *maquisard* successes."—*Le Nouvel Observateur.*

"More than a remarkably detailed reportage of the daily life of a guerrillero, this is both a study based on precise economic and political data and a technical treatise on a specific form of combat."—*L'Express.*

$1.95/90p PB1796

THE THIRD WORLD IN WORLD ECONOMY / PIERRE JALEE

The subject of this work is neo-colonialism: colonialism operating entirely through economic relations instead of, as before, through economic relations accompanied by political domination.

"A full-blooded assault is launched . . . on the idea that the rich world is in any real sense helping the poor world to develop . . . A closely argued, statistic-packed polemic. . . ."—*Sunday Times Business Section* (London).

$2.95/£1.35 PB177X

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STRATEGY FOR REVOLUTION: ESSAYS ON LATIN AMERICA / REGIS DEBRAY

Edited and introduction by Robin Blackburn

"Debray's Latin American essays, combining as they do brilliant first-hand reporting, subtle and original intellectual analysis and a high degree of personal commitment, are, for all their many weaknesses, essential reading for those who wish to understand the Latin American revolutionary movements of the 1960s—and, perhaps, the 1970s."—*Times Literary Supplement.*

". . . a first-rate volume. . . . This erudition is astonishing . . . his writings [possess] a literary merit and a penetrating insight. . . ."—*The Guardian* (London).

$2.95 PB180X

PERU 1965: NOTES ON A GUERRILLA EXPERIENCE / HECTOR BEJAR

"A manual on revolutionary warfare in Peru which will be important to anyone who wishes either to start or understand guerrilla campaigns in the hemisphere . . . not a mere propaganda diatribe, however. The writing is calm and the book has scholarly footnotes, statistical appendices, and a bibliography."—*Choice.*

". . . more important than his insights into the Peruvian revolutionary struggle is his approach: his objective critical appraisal based on statistical data and first-hand experience. . . ."—James Petras, *Science & Society.*

$1.95 PB1761

THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION AT PEKING UNIVERSITY / VICTOR NEE

". . . illuminating account . . . competent and workmanlike treatment. . . . [Nee] has done well to focus attention on a fascinating series of events which are not easily explained but which are of great importance in the evolution of modern China."—*Times Literary Supplement* (London).

"This fascinating descriptive essay . . . should interest not only specialists of contemporary China but also those concerned about student activism and educational reform."—*Pacific Affairs.*

$1.95/90p PB1788

INDIA INDEPENDENT / CHARLES BETTELHEIM

"Many books have been written on various aspects of this subject but this is one of the better ones . . . comprehensive in coverage. . . ."—*Library Journal.*

"[Bettelheim] was writing [in 1962] well before events in India reached the tilt-point of the 1967 general elections, but he read the trends accurately. His interpretation is Marxist and the Indian case fits snugly into the analytical framework."—*Times Literary Supplement* (London).

$3.95 PB1818

Monthly Review Press 33/37 Moreland Street, London, E.C. 1
116 West 14th Street, N.Y., N.Y. 10011

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

MORE ON THE CRISIS IN CANADA

The anonymous writer of "Crisis in Canada," published in the December issue of MR, makes a gross error . . . The author wrote: "On *Saturday,* October 17, Labor Minister Laporte was executed by the FLQ. The Trudeau government *responded* with the War Measures Act. . . ." (italics added) Six paragraphs before, the author wrote: "Last *Friday* the Liberal government of Prime Minister Trudeau passed the War Measures Act. . . ." (italics added) You cannot respond to something that hasn't happened. The War Measures Act came *before* the execution of Laporte.

This is no simple inconsequential confusion of dates. One must also ask why the MR editors failed to notice such a glaring internal inconsistency. It signifies a failure to understand, and a consequent inability to explain, the crisis. The following critique is not based on hindsight but on what was evident prior to October 20 when your correspondent wrote his letter.

Your correspondent is correct: the first and major demand of the FLQ (Liberation cell which held Cross) was the broadcast and publication of the FLQ Manifesto. This and the release of the political prisoners were the only key demands—not money or the name of an informer, as is claimed in the article. Totally unmentioned and certainly more important in the FLQ communiqués than money or the name of an informer was the demand that the Ottawa government rehire the Lapalme workers—400 men in the most militant postal union, who were sacked

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during a state offensive against real wage levels. But what is truly startling is that your correspondent nowhere states that the government in Ottawa, after subterfuge and delay, did accede to the FLQ demand to broadcast their Manifesto. This was a major government error. A "remarkable document," as your correspondent states: concrete, analytical, and dramatic. . . .

The Quebec media did not play their traditional role, the traditional role of all capitalist media: censorship, distortion, fragmentation of issues. By its actions the FLQ placed itself on an equal footing with the government. The FLQ used the media to communicate simultaneously with the populace. As a writer for *Le Devoir*—Quebec's equivalent in status to the *New York Times*—wrote:

> In one of the most dramatic events of the time, everything was laid out before the public, people were made aware of everything through the medium of the electronic media before the official—and powerless—representatives of authority were informed. All normal practice was thrown out: administrative, police, even diplomatic. There were no longer secrets, nor sliding panels, nor whispering in the backrooms.

Formal leaders of political parties, unions, citizens' organizations and the people directly said: we do not support the means but we do support the objectives of the FLQ. The Québécois did not remain silent as your correspondent asserts. They drew the line between themselves and the Ottawa government (and the Quebec government, as Bourassa increasingly revealed himself as Trudeau's puppet)—not between themselves and the FLQ. The editor of *Le Devoir,* René Lévesque (leader of the parliamentary independence Parti Québécois which received as much of the French-speaking vote in the last election as the governing Liberal party), the executives of the three major trade union confederations (500,000 members)—all publicly urged the exchange of political prisoners. The executive committee of the council of all national (Canadian) unions in Montreal said it "unequivocally supports all the objectives of the FLQ manifesto" and refused to condemn "those who no longer believe in 'democracy' and in judicial power dominated by an economic dictatorship which we have always denounced." Students and faculty in universities and junior colleges held mass assemblies

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and endorsed prisoner exchanges and the FLQ manifesto. It was to curtail this escalating participation, to crush this democratically expressed resistance of the Québécois to the hard line of Ottawa that troops occupied Quebec and the War Measures Act was imposed. If there was any doubt, one had only to read the lists, albeit partial, of those arrested on October 16 and 17: unionists, members and candidates of the Parti Québécois, artists, journalists, university faculty, citizen committee activists, lawyers—but hardly any even with alleged links with the FLQ.

The Manifesto and the War Measures Act, the dissemination of the first and the imposition of the second, are the two key "moments" in the crisis of authority and power in Quebec and in Canada. Heightened solidarity followed by heightened repression. The new forms of struggle will build on that solidarity and have to take into account the state's response to the independence movement, whether parliamentary or extra-parliamentary, social democratic or revolutionary: armed intervention. What this means concretely the Québécois will determine, and at this point it is not yet clear to the outsider.

But one thing is perfectly clear to the outsider in Canada and it is all too evident in your correspondent's letter. When the War Measures Act was first declared, the Canadian Left understood it literally and not politically. Literally it is "applicable to all of Canada" and as such would challenge "the very organizational existence of the left wing," as your correspondent phrases it. But the War Measures Act was applied only in Quebec, only to the internal colony. Once that was clear to the Canadian Left it became, in propaganda as well as actions, increasingly disinterested. The War Measures Act did not "challenge" the organizational existence of the Left. It *exposed* the Left's glaring weaknesses: in the immediate situation, its inability to cohere sufficiently to resist repression, and strategically its isolation from a geographically contiguous, cultural, political, and economic internal colony actively struggling for its national liberation. This judgment, with only slightly less severity, also applies to the U.S. movement. Quebec was part of Project Camelot, but it seems the ruling class still knows its colonies better than does the burgeoning revolutionary movement in North America.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR readers who wish background as well as continuing information on Quebec are invited to write the Free Quebec Free Canada Committee (FQFCC), 509 Carrall, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. They might also read Vallières' "Quebec: Nationalism and the Working Class" (MR, February 1965), and "Three Stages of Revolution" (MR, December 1968).

Mordecai Briemberg (Vancouver)
Bill Livant (Regina)

MORE ON THE INTERNATIONAL FLOW OF FUNDS

The reply to Professor Weaver in the MONTHLY REVIEW of November 1970 seems to be unnecessarily complicated. At any moment the great corporations in the United States are receiving a flow of profits which have been realized by sales at home and abroad. Home sales are partly from home employment and partly from goods produced by foreign labor (bananas, copper). Sales abroad are partly from exports produced by home labor and partly from goods produced by labor employed by subsidiaries of the corporations (Coca Cola, motor cars). At the same time, the corporations are looking around for new investments that promise to yield an additional flow of profits. Investments are financed out of already realized profits, augmented by borrowing. While investment is going on, it provides employment, mainly in the region where it takes place, and helps to support a market where profits can be realized. (This is the Keynesian aspect of the question.) When new installations are in operation, they have added to the stock of U.S.-owned capital, and they are yielding an increment of profits. To keep the process going it is necessary that there should be continually expanding prospects of profit. (This is the Rosa Luxemburg aspect of the question.) There may be doubts as to how long this can go on. This is the "real" aspect of a crisis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the point of view of the balance of payments, profits realized abroad are reckoned as exports. When the flow of finance abroad is greater than the surplus of exports, it is offset by a growth of dollar balances abroad or by a return flow of finance from capitalists abroad acquiring securities or financing direct investment in America. When the outflow of finance from America falls short of the surplus of exports, including remitted profits from abroad, the rest of the world suffers a financial crisis. It seems that the present administration is aiming to bring this about (improving the U.S. balance of payments), but they will not find the consequences agreeable.

Joan Robinson

Cambridge University
England
December 7, 1970

I would like to subscribe to

MONTHLY REVIEW

Special sub rates to students: $5 (foreign $6) 45s.
☐ 1 year $7 (foreign $8) 60s. ☐ 2 years $12 (foreign $14) 100s.

Monthly Review Press
116 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y. 10011

I enclose $.....

Monthly Review Press
33/37 Moreland Street
London, E.C. 1, England

I enclose £.....

Please send me MONTHLY REVIEW for
☐ two years
☐ one year

Name .....

Address .....

.....

(Canadian readers: if you pay in Canadian currency, please add 10 percent.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TO VIETNAM

BY ROBERTO FERNANDEZ RETAMAR

Holding their children to their breasts, the mothers watch the sky in terror that the wisemen's discoveries will appear there.

EVEN PLANTS AND ANIMALS

They've perverted even the plants and the animals:
Pineapple, Guava, Leaf, Tropical Tree,
Honey Bee, Butterfly, Bat,
and even Mother:
Here these are the names of terrible weapons,
new flora and fauna of these wise men.

WHAT WERE WE DOING?

What were we doing the 15th of July 1966?
The date tastes of beach, field, crops, friends.
In the fishing village of Ngu Thuy,
which was a fine place on the Pacific coast,
the 15th of July 1966
the American planes began to bomb.
And they continued for five days
until all the houses were destroyed
by the sounding Pacific.
What were we doing that day, ignorant ones?

Roberto Fernández Retamar is a well known Cuban poet and the director of the Casa de las Américas in Havana. The translations are by Margaret Randall and Robert Cohen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GATES OF HEAVEN

The Gates of Heaven (now we know)
are between Ha Tinh and Quang Binh.
In the province of Ha Tinh
the yankees made the *lunar landscape* of desert and craters
with sixteen thousand bombs in one month.
They call the province of Quang Binh
the charred earth:
The machine gun spared neither bridge nor forest there.
Between one province and the other
The Gates of Heaven go up, rudimentary,
Sure of justice.

SUNDAY

Among the several ways of spending a Sunday
this Sunday February 21 1970 we find another:
waiting for them to explode for us, for our cameras,
a six-hundred pound bomb that will blow up a house.
We begin to wait at nine in the morning.
At eleven we've waited a couple of times, breath held,
muscles tight.
At twelve-thirty they decide it's better to wait till the afternoon.
We have lunch, awkwardly upset.
At two we go out again.
At a quarter to three the cameras are ready once more.
A few minutes later, one shot, another, and another (it's the
signal)
and the house, five hundred feet away, disappears like a huge
door slamming,
a red and gold flame surrounded by endless black smoke
rises into the sky this strange Sunday in February.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Cutting Britain Down to Size

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, England was a small country with a young, ambitious business class, searching for wealth and reaching for power.

Through the next three centuries British business spread its power-network across the planet. The British pound sterling became the international medium of exchange. The British merchant fleet and the British Navy carried the Union Jack across every sea, to all the continents. British colonies and dependencies, more than 130 in number, covered a quarter of the planet.

Today, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth II, the British Empire has been cut down to size, as merely one of half a dozen European capitalist nations. The British business class, sharing power with the British Labor Party, has grown old, static, and conservative. The British Conservative Party, in a recent election, won a parliamentary majority. Its spokesman, Prime Minister Edward Heath, visited the United States at year's end. In an interview with *U.S. News and World Report* he defined the present-day role of Britain.

"We in Britain today," the Prime Minister said, "see our role for the future as part of a unified Europe. We see a strong, united Europe, acting as an equal partner with the United States and taking a larger share of the burden of making the world a better and a safer place to live in."

"*Question*: Beyond membership in the European community, what do you think will be Britain's place in terms of world power—a 'little England' or a 'big Britain'?"

"*Answer*: We could never go back to the little England of centuries ago. Nor can we be a super-power in the same sense that America is today. We shall be . . . a medium power of the first rank. We shall set our own order of priorities. Our own interests must come first. . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"*Question*: Is the era of the super-powers over, or can the Soviet Union and the United States together still dictate to the rest of the world?"

"*Answer*: Britain has not been dictated to by either Russians or Americans and does not intend to be dictated to. But there is no doubt that we are still in the era of the super-powers. They are in a class apart and are likely to remain so for a long time. . . . We want to build a stronger Western Europe that can make its voice clearly heard." (*U.S. News & World Report,* Dec. 21, 1970, p. 26)

Prime Minister Heath frankly recognizes Britain's new role as a second-rate world power. He is equally aware of the need for the nations of Western Europe to get together and work together. He has not yet learned the first principle of successful collective action: the interests of the whole must have precedence over the interests of any part. Until Mr. Heath and his opposite numbers in West Europe recognize this principle and act on it they will continue to be spokesmen for sovereign units, bickering among themselves, pawns in the big game played by the super-powers.

Another Marxist as President

Chilean voters, at their 1970 presidential election, cast about a third of their votes for Allende, a socialist who is backed by various elements on the Left. Three candidates were running. Dr. Allende's vote was therefore higher than that of his conservative and liberal rivals.

Under the Chilean constitution, if no presidential candidate has a majority of the votes cast, the Parliament chooses the president from the two candidates having the highest number of votes. The Chilean Parliament elected Dr. Allende.

President Allende calls himself a Marxist and a socialist. Three members of his cabinet are members of the Chilean Communist Party. His election platform pledged the new president to establish a socialist Chile.

Three Latin American states have been headed, recently, by Marxists: Guyana, Cuba, and Chile. Cheddi Jagan, backed by his Peoples Progressive Party, was elected three times by a majority vote and served three times as Prime Minister of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Guyana. Fidel Castro launched a revolution, drove out the incumbent and became head of the Cuban state. Dr. Allende won a plurality in the 1970 presidential election and was made President by a parliamentary vote.

Despite sharp opposition and stern warnings from conservative and counter-revolutionary elements in both North and South America, these three episodes give Marxists a substantial political foothold in a Latin America honeycombed with poverty and corruption, and seething with unrest and revolt.

Cheddi Jagan's government was swamped by CIA money, funnelled through AFL-CIO channels. Fidel Castro was able to sell his cash crop—sugar—to socialist governments in Europe and Asia, getting in exchange the manufactured goods which he so sorely needed.

President Allende will need aid, continued over a long period, to transform Chile from a satellite of the American Empire into the third socialist state that has emerged in Latin America. Counter-revolutionary forces will do everything in their power to undermine, divide, and destroy the new Chilean administration. It is up to the socialist states of Europe and Asia to provide sufficient backing and aid to give Allende and his government a good start in the socialist direction.

From the Frying Pan . . .

Five weeks in New York and vicinity ended on December 10 when I flew to London. It was a jump from the frying pan into the fire.

The day I left New York I took half a dozen packages to the Christopher Street Post Office in downtown New York. Most of the items were going home to my Maine address. "Sorry," said the clerk, "there's an embargo on all packages going beyond the third zone." I asked why. "Railroad strike," said he.

Next day, on the plane, I learned from British papers that electrical workers in England were engaged in a "work-to-rule" slowdown aimed at reducing the available electric current below normal consumption. The resulting shortages were distributed so that each region would get its quota, and wake up to the fact of an economic maladjustment in Britain.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Care was taken to provide current to hospitals, but most domestic and industrial users had their share of inconvenience. Day by day, papers printed a list of the districts that would suffer power shortage that day, but the times of the shut-down varied considerably and kept everyone guessing.

As the strike developed, British officialdom, including the Cabinet and the Prime Minister, were drawn into the controversy. At one point, Christmas window displays of the main stores were deprived of light.

I was booked for a flight to Paris, on British European Airways. A strike situation developed on all British airlines. Newspapers announced that negotiations between British European Airways personnel and the management were deadlocked and that a slow-down or strike was probable. I shifted my reservation to Air France and hoped to reach Paris eventually.

I had left New York in the paralyzing grip of its usual pre-Christmas rush. London was in the same predicament. Streets were crowded and stores jammed with customers. Merchants in London, like their New York counterparts, depend upon Christmastime for the bulk of their winter sales.

New York traffic in the Christmas rush is bad enough. By and large, London streets present more traffic problems than those in New York. As the Christmas season advanced, traffic grew thoroughly unmanageable. By the week before Christmas the tie-ups in midtown London were so serious that autos and busses were making a mile an hour when they were not completely stalled. The situation became so bad that daily papers published special appeals to motorists to leave their cars outside Central London and come in by bus.

Outside London, British traffic problems are much the same as those outside New York. Traffic lines move tightly morning and evening toward and away from the big city. In England, traffic problems are intensified by traditional British fogs. One such fog hit the London area as I was being driven to the airport. Visibility on the throughway dropped suddenly from bright sunshine to five yards. Fifty cars piled up, four people died, and a dozen were seriously hurt. In another fog-bound area 100 vehicles piled up, but there were no fatalities.

The pace in London is less frantic than that in New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is much less shoving and shouting and horn blowing. Generally the traditional British politeness prevails.

Here are other aspects of comparison between the two countries: Early in December New York papers published the U.S. Labor Department's November figures on unemployment. Complicated by the General Motors strike, the unemployment rate reached the highest level in seven years. The *Times* of London, on December 18, announced that "nearly 620,000 people were out of work in Britain last week. . . . The total was 18,000 more than for November, and the highest for a December since the war." Month by month, British unemployment in 1970 had been about 40,000 higher than in the same months of 1969. "Unemployment at this level involved the loss of seventeen times as many working days as would be lost through strikes this year."

During my stay in New York several bank robberies had made the headlines. Early in my London visit, robbers got £50,000 in one bank and £100,000 in another. The second hold-up was carried out in true Western-movie style. Eight men were involved. Two, armed with shot guns, stood guard at the two bank entrances. Others held up employes and customers, scooped up the booty and made off in waiting vehicles. During the excitement a woman in the crowd outside of the bank got separated from her baby who was in a pram near the bank door. A London Bobby happened along. He had a club, but no gun. Seeing the dilemma of the frantic mother, he edged over to the pram and, under the eyes of the armed robber who guarded the door, pushed the pram over toward the mother. From all accounts the presence of the policeman did not deter the robbers, nor prevent them from getting away with their booty.

The pace of life in cities all over the world is too frenzied and frantic for me as a country-dweller, though after New York life in London seems almost leisurely. However, during this pre-Christmas season, Britain's capital city was hectic enough to make me, as a country man, feel that when I crossed the Atlantic I had jumped from the frying pan into the fire.

A Great Leap

Spokesmen for the Planning Commission summarized Albania's spectacular rise from backwardness to modernization.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Before 1938, 80 percent of the people could not read or write. In some remote villages, illiteracy among women was up to 94 percent. Today the eight-year school is obligatory. All of the people under forty years can read and write.

Three out of every ten Albanian citizens now are students. The total is 600,000 in a population of two million. There are 40,000 high school students and 12,000 university students.

The results of this drive for education are met with on all sides. In 1938 there were 380 persons engaged in high level public service; in 1969 there were 15,000. In 1938 there were 35 engineers; in 1969, 3,400. In 1938 there were 45 agricultural technicians; in 1969, 1,800.

In the thirty-one years from 1938 to 1969:

Albania's population	doubled
Industrial production rose	60-fold
Investment in industry rose	150-fold
Production of electric energy rose	100-fold
Agricultural production rose	3½-fold
Per capita national income rose	4-fold
Death rate per 1,000 dropped from	18 to 7.5
The life span increased from	38 to 68 years

In 1971 Albanians are busy fulfilling a new five-year plan. The plan has been carefully drawn up, widely publicized in the country, studied, amended. Its fulfillment has become a national objective.

Three decades have sufficed for Albania's great leap from extreme backwardness to a high degree of modernization. The younger generation has made the transition with energy, enthusiasm, and dedication. At the beginning of this period Albania was a semi-feudal monarchy. In 1971 it is a largely self-contained socialist republic, building toward a communist society.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from inside front cover*)

1. There will be no "censored" edition. McClelland and Stewart is obligated to reproduce our edition exactly as it stands. The deletions of some difficult philosophical material (which we hope some day to consider as a separate little book in English) were made by Vallières himself two years ago at the suggestion of Maspero for the Paris edition, and Vallières suggested to us that we use the same cuts.

2. The translation is not being revised by anyone. The translation was given to Laurier LaPierre by McClelland and Stewart because, as they said, they were worried about whether a U.S. translator would get the Canadian French right, and he pronounced the translation excellent in all respects. The translation will be published as is, without cuts or changes, or it will not be published at all. We have been assured by McClelland and Stewart, both contractually and orally, that they will use exactly what we give them, and in fact may even photo our pages. Thus your correspondent is also wrong when he speaks of a delay due to "these revisions." McClelland and Stewart will only be a few weeks behind us, since they intend to produce and publish as fast as possible after they have our negatives.

3. In every case where a movement publication has requested the right to publish excerpts, we have granted that right either free or for an insignificant charge. We resent especially the charge that we made arrangements with McClelland and Stewart to be the Canadian publishers "to make a fast buck." So far as we know, *all* the houses that applied to us for the rights are commercial Canadian houses, and each would have been willing to pay the same nominal advance we are receiving from McClelland and Stewart, so that money (much of which goes to *Parti Pris* and Vallières himself) played no role. In view of the importance of the book, and the Canadian situation, we felt that the best interests of the book, and the author, and the cause would be served by giving it to the house which could give it the widest possible circulation. Whether we are right or wrong in this, I can see no reason for your correspondent to impugn our motives so savagely.

We have had the book for two years, and translation-to-publication generally takes publishing houses perhaps eighteen months, and we regret the delay more than anyone. All of us connected with the project have worked as hard as we could to bring the book out as rapidly as possible, and we have gone to the extent, in recent weeks, of sending an editor to the plant four hundred miles away to read proofs, in order to save a few days. Our translator was hampered by illness, and we were hampered by limited funds and great pressure to produce many books, but we certainly regret these delays, much as many of them were beyond our power to control.

I assume you will agree that, regardless of any opinions you or your correspondent may hold about Monthly Review Press, your readers are due the true information, and we are due the courtesy of an apology for your misstatements. Certainly Pierre Vallières, his extraordinary book, and his cause will not be helped by surrounding the Canadian publication of the English edition of his book with such a cloud of falsehood and misinformation.

Sincerely yours,
/s/ Harry Braverman

To this we need only add that there will of course be a Canadian paperback edition, which, we understand, will follow the cloth edition by roughly the same delay as in the case of the U.S. edition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: Writings on the Paris Commune

Edited by Hal Draper

This centennial edition of the writings of Marx and Engels on the Paris Commune appears at a time when interest in the Marxist theory of the state is at a peak, and is being re-examined from all angles, in its aspects as a theory of revolution and as a theory of reconstruction of the social order.

The inclusion of previously unavailable writings and the careful and complete annotation by Hal Draper make this the most useful edition of Marx and Engels on the Commune available.

The French events of 1870-1871 caused Marx and Engels to react with extraordinary vigor because they saw in them the embodiment of their perspective for a future society, even if dimly outlined. "As almost only workers, or recognised representatives of the workers, sat in the Commune," Engels was later to point out, "its decisions bore a decidedly proletarian character." Therefore, and especially after the "Revolution of March 18, 1871" in Paris, they followed the events with the closest attention and commented on them exhaustively.

The three addresses of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association (the last being *The Civil War in France*) summarized their views, and these texts are included in this volume with detailed annotations essential for a full understanding of the course of events and analysis. Included as well are Marx's first two drafts for *The Civil War in France*. These previously unavailable documents provide a great deal of material omitted from the final version, and are essential for tracing the development of Marx's thinking on the Commune. Engels' Introduction to the 1891 edition of *The Civil War in France* is also included.

Finally, Hal Draper has collected the most important further comments by Marx and Engels, from letters and miscellaneous writings before, during, and after the Commune.

Hal Draper has been an editor of a number of socialist periodicals—*New International, Labor Action, New Politics, Independent Socialist*—and is a frequent writer on socialist politics and Marxist theory. He is the author of *Berkeley: The New Student Revolt* (1965) and *The Dirt on California: Agri-Business and the University* (1968). He is Chairman of the Independent Socialist Alliance, and under the imprint of Independent Socialist Press, edits a series of collections and reprints of socialist literature. He is at present working on a study of Marx and Engels' political views entitled *Karl Marx's Theory of Revolution.*

$7.95/£3.60 CL1737

Monthly Review Press 116 West 14th Street, N.Y., N.Y. 10011
33/37 Moreland Street, London, E.C. 1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED